



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



EWS

FALL-WINTER 2009

Vol. 67

Nos. 3&5

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 57, Nos. 3&4

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 67, Nos. 3&4

FALL-WINTER, 2009

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
Texas A&M University

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

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

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

ISSN 0037-3028

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON

Texas A&M University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

James Egan, University of Akron
Jeffrey Walker, Oklahoma State University
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo
Patricia Garcia, University of Texas
E. Joe Johnson, Clayton State University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

Jacob Schornick, Texas A&M University

CONTENTS

VOLUME 67, NOS. 3&4..... FALL-WINTER, 2009

REVIEWS

- Cyndia Susan Clegg, *Press Censorship in Caroline England*. Review by
ELIZABETH SKERPAN-WHEELER..... 93
- Robert J. Wickenheiser, *The Robert J. Wickenheiser Collection of John Milton at
the University of South Carolina*. Review by PAUL A. PARRISH..... 96
- Gordon Campbell and Thomas N. Corns, *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought*.
Review by ANNA K. NARDO 99
- John T. Shawcross, *The Development of Milton's Thought: Law, Government, and
Religion*. Review by JOHN MULRYAN..... 102
- William Shullenberger, *Lady in the Labyrinth: Milton's Comus as Initiation*.
Review by MITCHELL M. HARRIS..... 106
- Margaret Olofson Thickett, *Milton's Paradise Lost: Moral Education*. Review
by JAMES EGAN..... 109
- Shannon Miller, *Engendering the Fall: John Milton and Seventeenth-Century Women
Writers*. Review by LISA J. SCHNELL..... 112
- Laura Lunger Knoppers, ed., *The Complete Works of John Milton: Volume II*.
Review by LARA M. CROWLEY..... 115
- Gary Kuchar, *The Poetry of Religious Sorrow in Early Modern England*. Review
by P. G. STANWOOD..... 119
- Alison Shell, *Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England*. Review by
ROBERT LANDRUM..... 123
- Elena Levy-Navarro, *The Culture of Obesity in Early and Late
Modernity: Body Image in Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton, and Skelton*.
Review by GARY KUCHAR..... 125

Theresa DiPasquale, <i>Refiguring the Sacred Feminine: The Poems of John Donne, Aemilia Lanyer, and John Milton</i> . Review by JUDITH SCHERER HERZ	129
P.G. Stanwood, <i>John Donne and the Line of Wit: From Metaphysical to Modernist</i> . Review by MITCHELL M. HARRIS.....	132
Jennifer Summit, <i>Memory's Library: Medieval Books in Early Modern England</i> . Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL.....	134
Bruce R. Smith, <i>The Key of Green: Passion and Perception in Renaissance Culture</i> . Review by IRA CLARK.....	138
John Kerrigan, <i>Archipelagic English: Literature, History and Politics 1603-1707</i> . Review by EUGENE D. HILL	142
Matthew Birchwood, <i>Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685</i> . Review by HUMBERTO GARCIA	145
Emily C. Bartels, <i>Speaking of the Moor: From Alcazar to Othello</i> . Review by ANTHONY G. BARTHELEMY	149
Catharine Gray, <i>Women Writers and Public Debate in 17th-Century Britain</i> . Review by MAURIZIO FARINA	151
Kate Chedgzoy, <i>Women's Writing in the British Atlantic World: Memory, Place and History, 1550-1700</i> . Review by LISSA BEAUCHAMP DESROCHES	154
Anne Dunan-Page, ed., <i>The Religious Culture of the Huguenots 1660-1750</i> . Review by RUTH WHELAN	159
Steven Matthews, <i>Theology and Science in the Thought of Francis Bacon</i> . Review by MARK G. SPENCER.....	163
David Booy, <i>The Notebooks of Nehemiah Wallington, 1618-1654. A Selection</i> . Review by WAYNE SPARKMAN.....	166
J. S. Maloy, <i>The Colonial American Origins of Modern Democratic Thought</i> . Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK	170
R. Tudur Jones, Arthur Long, and Rosemary Moore, eds., <i>Protestant Nonconformist Texts, Volume 1: 1550 to 1700</i> . Review by STEVEN PAUL MATTHEWS	174

Rosemary O'Day, ed., <i>Cassandra Brydges, Duchess of Chandos, 1670-1735: Life and Letters</i> . Review by ELLEN J. JENKINS.....	176
Vernon Hyde Minor, <i>The Death of the Baroque and the Rhetoric of Good Taste</i> . Review by KATHERINE M. BENTZ.....	179
Alexander Cowan, <i>Marriage, Manners and Mobility in Early Modern Venice</i> . Review by R. BURR LITCHFIELD.....	182
SimonMcKeown and MaraR.Wade, eds., <i>The Emblem in Scandinavia and the Baltic</i> . And Simon McKeown, <i>Emblematic Paintings from Sweden's Age of Greatness. Nils Bielke and the Neo-Stoic Gallery at Skokloster</i> . Review by LARS BURMAN.....	185
Katherine Ibbett, <i>The Style of the State in French Theater, 1630-1660. Neoclassicism and Government</i> . Review by MICHAEL MEERE.....	189
Fernand Hallyn, <i>Descartes: Dissimulation et Ironie</i> . Review by REBECCA WILKIN.....	193
Alain Rey, <i>Antoine Furetière: Un précurseur des Lumières</i> . Review by DAVID EICK	197
Marion Kobelt-Groch and Cornelia Niekus Moore, eds., <i>Tod und Jenseits in der Schriftkultur der Frühen Neuzeit</i> . Review by FRANK SOBIECH	200
Anna Linton, <i>Poetry and Parental Bereavement in Early Modern Lutheran Germany</i> . Review by SUSAN R. BOETTCHER	204
John Whenham and Richard Wistreich, eds., <i>The Cambridge Companion to Monteverdi</i> . Review by STEVEN SAUNDERS.....	207
Laura A. Lewis, <i>Hall of Mirrors: Power, Witchcraft, and Caste in Colonial Mexico</i> . Review by PATRICIA M. GARCÍA.....	211
Jonathan Sawday, <i>Engines of the Imagination: Renaissance Culture and the Rise of the Machine</i> . Review by Scott Maisano.....	214
NEO-LATIN NEWS.....	219

Cyndia Susan Clegg. *Press Censorship in Caroline England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. vii + 289 pp. \$99.00. Review by ELIZABETH SKERPAN-WHEELER, TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY-SAN MARCOS.

In *Press Censorship in Elizabethan England* (1997), *Press Censorship in Jacobean England* (2002), and now this volume, Cyndia Susan Clegg turns away from grand narratives on freedom of speech, notably that of F. S. Siebert in his *Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776* (1952), still the standard reference on the subject, to offer a much more complex appreciation of the nature of censorship and its relations to contemporary understanding of property rights, the business of printing, authorship and personal expression, in the contentious climate of early modern England. Following the practice of her previous studies, Clegg at once extensively engages previous scholarship while presenting meticulous original research into the English book trade and its intersections with the political and religious concerns of the day, as well as sensitive analysis of both the contents and reception of noteworthy controversial books. What Clegg's research shows is a marked change in both the understanding and practice of censorship during the reign of Charles I. Before 1625, censorship principally concerned obedience to the Elizabethan religious settlement and maintenance of the property rights of the Stationers' Company, that is, the regulation of the book trade. Under Charles, however, there developed a broad "cultural awareness of censorship" (42) that ultimately involved Parliament as well as the wider political public. *Press Censorship in Caroline England* thus demonstrates that our own comprehension of the controversial literature of the period must depend on our awareness of the political and legal contexts that governed its authors, printers, and readers.

At the heart of the matter of Caroline censorship, Clegg argues in her second chapter, was the impact of religious controversy in 1625-29, provoked by changes within the Church of England urged by Arminian clergy. While acknowledging that historians disagree about the particulars and extent of the debate, notably that over predestination, Clegg rightly notes that contemporaries *perceived* serious and radical departures from what they saw as established church doctrine. Thus, Calvinist clergy, self-characterized as the "godly" party, began

to write in the “spirit of political counsel” (58), opposing Arminian innovations to what had been Anglican orthodoxy. As Clegg describes them, godly writers felt that they represented the majority of clergy and saw themselves as being persecuted by a minority favored by the Crown. While godly clergy were indeed affected by new policies promulgated between 1625 and 1629, their perception of persecution did not correspond to the actual practice of censorship in the period. Clegg shows that there continued to be an extensive market for godly books, that in fact most books published in England in the late 1620s were godly, and that “few books were actually suppressed, and those that were differed little from those that were not” (78).

However, godly feelings did have some foundation in fact. First, censorship was now explicitly directed at writers. Charles’s censorship proclamation of 1626, for example, “criminalize[d] theological disputation—a practice long established in the Church of England—and turn[ed] its practitioners into opponents of Church and State” (62). Thus, Anglican clergymen who saw themselves as upholders of the Articles of Religion were now officially associated with the most virulent opponents of the Church of England itself. Second, this practice of guilt by association signaled a significant increase in official interest in disputatious writing: the beginnings of an emerging “culture of censorship” (95). Such a climate polarized debate in ways that many participants had not expected.

In her subsequent four chapters, Clegg traces the consequences of this polarization. Chapter three explores the changes Charles and Archbishop Laud made to the institutions of the Courts of High Commission and Star Chamber. Employing what Clegg calls “transformational literalism,” an “innovation upon former precedents” (103) that enabled a radical departure from the practice but not the letter of the law, Charles and Laud turned both courts into instruments for controlling religious opposition. In the case of Star Chamber, this meant, among other matters, a change in the definition of “sedition” that greatly expanded the number of books that were considered illegal. In Chapter four, Clegg presents an engaging re-examination of the well known “show trials” of the 1630s, those of William Prynne in 1634 and of Prynne, Henry Burton, and John Bastwick in 1637. Held in a climate of increasing restriction on the

printing of godly books, the trials illustrated to contemporaries the growing rigor of licensing. Because the restrictions on printing were largely successful, Clegg sees the trials as “anomalous and desperate efforts to contain religious opposition” (181) indicating that Laud and Charles had woefully misread their opponents, failing to understand that even moderate clergy did see Laud’s changes in the Church as innovations. As Chapter five demonstrates, their efforts to restrain all theological disputation radically increased demand for such books, and that demand prompted further expansion of both governmental concepts of sedition and writers’ ingenuity in circumventing censorship by, for example, employing “paratextual materials to alter a text’s original intention” (203).

This climate of governmental suspicion of any and all oppositional writing led Charles to misjudge seriously the nature of the political and religious problems erupting in Scotland in the late ‘30s. In Chapter six Clegg notes that “Scottish writing fed government anxieties about English Puritanism,” to the point where both Charles and Laud may have been “driven” (211) by fears of English Puritan plots. We may infer that their inability to comprehend the nature of their religious opposition—perceiving all criticism as radical and dangerous—contributed to the political blunders that led to the civil wars. And yet Clegg’s account reminds us that some of their difficulties may have arisen simply because they failed to grasp the fact that fundamental changes were happening to print culture. By 1640, print was regarded as another form of public speaking that could not be entirely repressed. In concluding with a brief account of parliamentary censorship in the 1640s and Milton’s *Areopagitica*, Clegg reminds us that, while they decried the abuses of the Crown, most public officials shared Charles’s belief in the need to hold authors accountable for their words and the responsibility of government to retain control over public expression of all kinds. Fundamental changes in censorship laws would happen only with a widespread appreciation of cultural changes forced by practice within print culture.

Press Censorship in Caroline England should be essential to any scholar seriously interested in the interrelationship of politics and media. It offers a sound education in the scholarship on censorship as well as a thorough explanation of the book trade and the practice

of controversial writing during the reign of Charles I. Moreover, it provides a reminder to scholars and critics of the importance of the audience's perceptions and authors' intents. Because of the extent of Clegg's engagement with previous scholarship, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish Clegg's own arguments. In this densely written book, more summarization would have been welcome. This criticism aside, this book is necessary reading for anyone attempting to interpret the political and religious discourse of early seventeenth-century England.

Robert J. Wickenheiser. *The Robert J. Wickenheiser Collection of John Milton at the University of South Carolina*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2008. xvi + 928 pp. + 294 illus. \$90.00. Review by PAUL A. PARRISH, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

Robert J. Wickenheiser's engaging account of the Wickenheiser Collection in the University of South Carolina library is several books within one very large one. It begins with a review of Wickenheiser's life as a book collector, told with considerable detail and with consistent appreciation to fellow book collectors, booksellers, and others who enabled the collection to grow to more than six thousand volumes. It is substantively (over 640 pages) a Descriptive Listing of Editions in the collection, with more than sixty seventeenth-century editions and numerous illustrated editions, making this surely the most inclusive collection of illustrated Milton found anywhere. The book also includes a Descriptive Listing of Miltoniana (over 70 pages) in the collection, arranged alphabetically within each century and beginning with a first edition of Giovanni Batista Andreini's *L'Adamo Sacra Representatione* (1617), a work scholars have associated with *Paradise Lost*. Wickenheiser's collection includes 375 anthologies, and the book offers a selection of anthologies arranged chronologically, from *The English Parnassus* (1677) to a number of anthologies from the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. Because Wickenheiser's interest in collecting Milton began with an emphasis on illustrated editions, it is especially appropriate and aesthetically illuminating to see a further section of the book devoted to Original Drawings, Illustrations, Engravings, and Other, including some of the most

important and best known illustrations of *Paradise Lost* by John Bell, Henry Fuseli, and Henry Richter. The illustrator John Martin (1789–1854) merits a separate section to himself, with twelve illustrations reproduced, most, though not all, pertaining to *Paradise Lost*. Finally, there are briefer sections on Ephemera and Objets d'Art, Photographs of Additional Select Items, and an Appendix on Recent Additions of Note, the last confirming that this very large and very important collection is ongoing.

Wickenheiser's opening essay is both an introduction to the collection and an autobiographical account of the origins and history of his nearly lifelong interest in Milton. Wickenheiser began his professorial career at Princeton University in 1970, and, until his retirement, he was for more than 25 years a university president, first at Mount St. Mary's College in Maryland and then at St. Bonaventure University in New York. A reader is struck by both the recollection of details and the generosity of the collector as he pays tribute to his wife, friends, fellow collectors, booksellers and scholars who increasingly enabled the growth of what began modestly into the collection as it stands today. Wickenheiser describes his initial efforts as a graduate student at the University of Minnesota in the late 1960s, where local estate sales yielded some of his first acquisitions. As he came more and more to focus on Milton and, in particular, illustrated editions, a combination of serendipity and relentless searching produced impressive find after impressive find.

Clearly, this section of the book will most appeal to book lovers and book collectors, but in many ways it speaks to the characteristics of a collector more generally—a determined focus, a commitment of time and money, a willingness to sacrifice—in Wickenheiser's case, food, vacations, and other forms of “down” time—so as to continue the quest for elusive items to add to the collection.

The 2767 items included in the Descriptive Listing of Editions are models of clarity and information, and the occasional illustrations in this section add considerably to the pleasure of the written descriptions. Wickenheiser provides information about each publication, its contents, and the condition of the volume. He also provides useful references to scholarly catalogs or other contemporary citations, notably K. A. Coleridge's *Descriptive Catalogue of the Milton Collection in the*

Alexander Turnbull Library and *The Catalogue of the Kobler Collection of John Milton*. Wickenheiser's notes on the volumes, which are occasionally supplemented by notes on larger textual issues—such as his discussion of the first edition of *Paradise Lost* and its title pages (155)—reveal his careful attention to the work of contemporary scholars, notably John Shawcross, whom he acknowledges in his introduction and frequently in his notes.

The section on Miltoniana includes 352 items, 52 of them from the seventeenth century, including Andreini's *L'Adamo Sacra Rappresentazione*, as mentioned above, an edition of Charles I's *Eikon Basilike*, possibly owned by Robert Southey, and a first edition of Edward Phillips's *Theatrum Poetarum*, among other impressive and important volumes. In his introduction to this book, Wickenheiser comments on his interest in anthologies going back to his days as a professor at Princeton, convinced, as he says, that attention to anthologies "will make a great study or studies on the reading choices of a given age" (28). Of the some 375 anthologies in the collection as a whole, 44 are identified and described in the book (not including additional anthologies listed under particular poems).

If the primary substance of Wickenheiser's book is rightly devoted to the editions and Miltoniana, the beauty is seen especially in the illustrations attending the final four sections on Original Drawings, Illustrations, Engravings, and Other; John Martin; Ephemera and Objets d'Art; and Photographs of Additional Select Items. Examples of the visually represented items are many and varied, ranging from portraits of Milton to illustrations from *Paradise Lost* or other poems, to sculptures, to advertisements, playing cards, and postage stamps. Particularly intriguing are fore-edge paintings, scenes or figures painted on the fore-edge of a book but visible only when the pages of the book are slightly bent or fanned so as to reveal the illustration. When fully closed, the painting is, if done well, hidden from view. Wickenheiser includes a number of impressive examples of this art.

Perhaps the highest compliment to be paid to the book itself is that it makes a reader anxious to see the full collection at the University of South Carolina. Wickenheiser and his publishers at the University of South Carolina Press have done a masterful job in creating a descriptive and illustrative catalog of important items in the collection

that is informative, engaging, and aesthetically appealing. It more than justifies the observation of John Shawcross, cited by Wickenheiser in his introduction, that the Wickenheiser collection is “one of the major collections of materials related to John Milton, editions and studies and artworks, in the world” (31).

Gordon Campbell and Thomas N. Corns. *John Milton: Life, Work, and Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. xvi + 488 pp. + 48 illus. \$39.95. Review by ANNA K. NARDO, LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY.

John Milton’s life makes a great story, and Gordon Campbell and Thomas N. Corns tell it well. By their account, Milton “is flawed, self-contradictory, self-serving, arrogant, passionate, ruthless, ambitious, and cunning” (3). Yet, “what he achieved in the face of crippling adversity, blindness, bereavement, political eclipse, remains wondrous” (4). Campbell and Corns come to their final judgment that “This is a hero’s life” (4), however, only after scrupulously returning to the archival evidence—from minutes of academic meetings in Florence to burial records in the Horton parish Church, from the salary records of Protectorate functionaries to the minutia of handwriting variants. They employ the most recent developments in Stuart historiography, formidable linguistic expertise in Greek and Latin, and the arts of rhetorical analysis to create a revisionary biography of a figure whose life has often taken on mythic status.

Two themes that dominate their study are Milton’s early Arminianism and his uneven progress throughout his life toward radicalization. Explicating these themes, they tell the story of a poet/polemicist actively engaged with an unfolding revolution. After Milton’s dispute with his first Cambridge tutor, they read in his father’s choice of a replacement “a continuity of Arminian and ceremonialist influence” (40). In the timing of the move to Hammersmith, where Milton joined his family upon leaving Cambridge, Campbell and Corns read Milton senior’s attraction of “the opening of a Laudian chapel that accorded with his ecclesiastical preferences” (68). Then, in Milton’s Ludlow masque, written during his long residence at Hammersmith, Campbell and Corns read a “complex and thorough expression of

Laudian Arminianism and Laudian style . . . indeed the high-water mark of his indulgence of such beliefs and values” (84). When, however, the Miltons experienced, first hand, Laudian authoritarianism and sacerdotalism in the church’s objections to the orientation of Sara Milton’s gravestone (96), and when so many of the “middling sort” were scandalized by the spectacle of William Prynne’s public mutilations, Milton, according to Campbell and Corns, “began to bid William Laud good night” (95).

As Milton engaged the proliferating controversies of his revolutionary times, he becomes, to Campbell and Corns, a moving target. Now, he shares soteriological positions with General Baptists, then, anti-clerical positions with Quakers (194-95), and even an interest in polygamy with radical Anabaptists (275). Now, he eloquently attacks pre-publication censorship; then, “taking the republican equivalent of the king’s shilling,” he became a “servant of the state” and a “practitioner of pre-publication censorship” (247). Once, he attacked the authoritarianism of Charles I and Laud, then, however, when Cromwell dismisses the Parliament, and other prominent figures like Bradshaw and Vane object or retire, “Milton stayed on” (251). Now, a reticent public servant, then, after Cromwell’s death, Milton published arguments for toleration of a wide spectrum of Protestant belief and against the investment of political power in a single person (289). The detailed historical contextualization provided by Campbell and Corns weaves the twists and turns of Milton’s thought and actions into the fabric of England’s revolutionary experiment.

Their careful contextualization also illuminates events and works that have often puzzled Milton scholars. For example, they reconstruct Milton’s participation in raucous college disputations, especially his most famous Proclusion that ends with “At a Vacation Exercise,” by explaining the conventions of the “salting” and by untangling the story of drunken students who tumbled into (or urinated in) the King’s Ditch (59-60). They correct common misinterpretations of the “contempt” with which Milton’s messenger, sent to request Mary Powell’s return, was treated, by detailing the historical evidence that “ideologically suspect visitors from London were subject to rough treatment in royalist strongholds alert to the danger from spies” (157). At one point, the mighty labor in archives among dusty tomes that allows

them to bring the past to life seems to have rendered Campbell and Corns quite impatient with Milton's comparatively "shallow scholarship." Noting that he bases *The History of Britain* "wholly on published sources," they sniff, "Milton suggests that no liberal scholar would waste his time on the kind of dross the antiquaries worked on" (356). By contrast, these two modern antiquaries turn dross into true coin.

Campbell and Corns do for Milton's prose what Barbara Lewalski did for Milton's poetry in her 2000 contribution to the Blackwell Critical Biographies series. Each of her chapters ends with a brief, but rich analysis of a work, most often a poem or poems, written during the years discussed in the chapter. Likewise, throughout their biography, Campbell and Corns provide concise, but rich discussions of many of Milton's prose treatises, interweaving historical contextualization with artful analysis of Milton's varying prose styles. Comparing Milton's contributions to the anti-episcopal debate to others' tracts, they demonstrate that "Milton brought . . . a new, undeferential, incisive, vivid, violent, and vindictive perspective to the Smectymnuan cause" (143). Contrasting "the indecorous flashiness of Charles" to Milton's disciplined, unflamboyant prose in *Eikonoklastes*, they claim that Milton's answer to *Eikon Basilike* was "powerfully persuasive, reminding [his targeted audience] of the ceremonialism and repressiveness of the Caroline church" (226-27). And deftly explicating the "allusive and lexical pyrotechnics" of Milton's *Pro Se Defensio*, they relate Alexander More's alleged summerhouse trysts to labored jokes about priapic statues, figs, mulberries ("morus"), and penile mushrooms. "Sadly," they sigh, "the humour has lost little in translation" (264-65).

Obviously, their mastery of prose analysis is matched by their own artful prose. Indeed, one of the pleasures of this biography is its readability; it is full of humanizing zingers. A paragraph on "L'Allegro" ends, "These are not the pleasures of a radical-in-waiting, but of one who loves cakes and ale" (61). A summation of all Milton encountered in Italy ends "Not to mention some decent cooking" (127). Campbell and Corns even turn their own biting prose against the master, as when they describe "Of Education," as "repressive, prescriptive, elitist, masculinist, militaristic, dustily pedantic, class-ridden, and affectionless" (181). But a review should not give away all the good lines.

It is, however, a shame that such a well-researched and entertaining work of scholarship should be marred by bad production values. Many of the forty-eight illustrations are so dark and blurred that their relevance to the analyses they are supposed to complement is wholly lost. By contrast, the illustrations in Anna Beer's 2008 biography, *Milton: Poet, Pamphleteer, and Patriot* (Bloomsbury Press) are clear and helpfully illustrative, sometimes in color.

John T. Shawcross. *The Development of Milton's Thought: Law, Government, and Religion*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2008. x + 283 pp. \$60.00. Review by JOHN MULRYAN, ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY.

The title of this book, *The Development of Milton's Thought*, is an implicit rebuke to those Miltonists who see Milton's thought as consistent, constant, and unchanging. Part of the problem (explored in chapter one, "Milton and Constancy of Thought"), according to Shawcross, is that critics focus on individual works without taking into account the complete oeuvre of Milton. For "not all of what he wrote has been read" (5). In addition, critics tend to reshape Milton's thought until it is congruent with their own thinking, which is of course (in their minds) absolutely correct: "Too often critics espouse their own thinking as Milton's position or find Milton's thinking so opposed to theirs that Milton therefore is wrong" (5). Others conveniently forget that fiction is not fact, and that poetry does not pretend to literal truth. Milton is at one with orthodox Christians in the fundamentals (the "constancy of belief in God's omnipresence and omnipotence"[3]), but at odds with them in doctrinal views of the Trinity: "Milton's theological position [on the Trinity and other subjects] in both *De doctrina* and *Paradise Lost* is unorthodox" (ix).

In chapter two, "Milton and Legal Matters," Shawcross notes that Milton's father and Milton himself were involved in "usurious activities" (34). Usury, however, did not, in Protestant England, bear the stigma associated with the practice in the middle ages; as Shawcross points out, Calvin himself defended usury. Milton also took a healthy interest in intellectual property rights (including of course those of his own texts), and physical property as well. And although there is no hint

of illegality in Milton's handling of financial and legal matters, they do bear the scent of hypocrisy and inconsistency. In chapter three, "Milton the Republican," Shawcross is at pains to point out that our own definition of a republic today differs significantly from Milton's employment of the term. Republicanism did not, in Milton's mind, embrace either the commonality of men or any woman! There is also the issue of his fierce antagonism toward both Jews and Catholics. "Unavoidable is the realization that 'the people' are delimited—republican in sentiment but not democratic, not egalitarian, and not even, really, given equity" (58).

The basic thrust of chapter four, "Milton, the Church, and Theology," is that Milton did not belong to any particular Protestant denomination, i.e. he is not fully Calvinist or Unitarian or Presbyterian, but takes an eclectic attitude toward Protestant doctrine. His resistance to fully adopting the tenets of the religion in which he was baptized, the Church of England, was no doubt tied in with the ruthless enactment of "Popish" practices and literalist excesses by William Laud, archbishop of Canterbury, particularly his brutal treatment of honest dissenters from his policies, including "... the notorious imprisonment and mutilation of William Prynne, John Bastwick, and Henry Burton in June [1637] through the Laudian controls over the church" (74).

In chapter five, "Theological Concerns, Especially the Trinity," Shawcross takes up Milton's anti-trinitarian views. As Shawcross notes, Milton rejects the concept of a triune god because he consistently "rejected traditional beliefs that are not explicitly stated in Scripture" (84). The concept is associated with a biblical text (1 John 5:7), but Erasmus (d. 1536) (among others) regarded that text as spurious. The Trinity did not become part of Christian orthodox thought until the Council of Nicea (AD 325) and the term "trinitas" first appeared in the works of Tertullian (d. 220). In other ways Milton is a traditional Christian: "Belief in the orthodox birth of Jesus Christ and of the Virgin Mary appears often in the poetry" (88).

In chapter six, "Theological Concerns, the Son, and the Divine Presence," Shawcross explains that the Father and the Son are viewed as separate entities in both *Paradise Lost* and the *De Doctrina Christiana*. The Holy Spirit is the manifestation of God's will, but not part of the personage of God. In effect, Milton expresses a belief in a

dual rather than a triune God: In the *De Doctrina Christiana* “there is absolute and explicit belief in the Son as the Son of God and thus as part of the Godhead . . . he thus casts God as one being who is two persons” (112). Most Miltonists, who prefer to avoid the subject altogether, would not accept this view of Milton’s God. Shawcross’s view of the antithetical personalities of Milton’s Father and Son is more generally accepted: “The strong, rather unyielding attitude of the Father—a masculinist view stereotypically—is ameliorated by the merciful and loving nature of the Son—a view often associated with woman” (117). Milton follows the orthodox Protestant position in denying the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and asserting the commemorative nature of the sacrifice. Christ is present in spirit in the Eucharist, but not in body. The nature of that spiritual presence remains (at least in Shawcross’s terms) vague and ill-defined: “The Real Presence of the Christ is denied in the Eucharist, but a Divine Presence of a different sort is there” (130).

In chapter seven, “Conceptual Reflections in Milton’s Poetry and Prose,” Shawcross notes that the original sin is not complete in Milton (or in the Bible) until Adam partakes of the forbidden fruit. Adam’s act, as Milton puts it, is the “compleating of the mortal Sin / Original” (cited 138: *Paradise Lost* 9.1003-1004). Thus Milton rejects the misreading of the Bible that results in “the genderization of humankind into good [man] and evil [woman]” (138). “Eve’s eating of the fruit brings sin, and Adam’s eating of the fruit establishes death” (137). A careful reading of *Paradise Lost* will also disabuse us of the notion that Satan is the hero of the poem: “It is not Milton’s concept of Satan that has changed as we work our way through the poem: it is the reader’s having fallen into his trap of finding in Satan a ‘heroic’ figure that *should* have changed, for in life humankind does seem to find evil, immorality, and fairly exclusive selfness attractive” (150). Milton also makes use of a complex network of alternating allusions to classical myth and biblical lore to convey his meaning in *Paradise Lost*: “The interlocking allusions and echoes lead to readings placing the events and persons of the epic into a continuous panorama of mythic and biblical lore, setting up comparisons and contrasts that in turn amplify and alter our inference of what we state as John Milton’s message and beliefs and artistic achievement in this work”

(144). Shawcross illustrates this point through an extended analysis of key words in the poem: “dubious,” “seem,” “gaze,” and “convey.”

In chapter eight, “The Three Major Poems,” Shawcross reminds us that these poems were probably composed over a considerable period of time, allowing for the maturation of Milton’s thought and demonstrating the consistency of his thought on fundamental ethical and theological principles: “We are perceiving an unchanged mind about Milton’s morality and his God” (167). Like *Paradise Lost*, Milton’s last two poems are also exemplars of Milton’s fidelity to Christian belief: “*Paradise Regain’d* propounds an unchanging theological belief in God and God’s ‘ways’ to humankind. *Samson Agonistes* ventures to assert through the Chorus and their reading of Samson’s action and fate a long-held belief in God’s omnipresence and omniscience” (168).

In chapter nine, “Unchanging Belief and the Changed Mind,” Shawcross speculates on the possible erosion of some of Milton’s religious beliefs. Caught “between the past and the coming age,” “Milton did not fully understand the changes that were occurring in philosophical (including religious) thinking during his lifetime” (175, 174). Thus Milton frequently changed his mind, but never lost his faith in God and the scriptures. Some of his beliefs mellowed and matured, some (like the Trinity) fell by the wayside. Like all human beings, he was a prisoner of his times: caught between the believing and the rational world, he held on to his core beliefs without fully understanding the intellectual forces that would soon sweep them away. Shawcross reminds us that Milton was a complex man with a powerful intellect who simply could not, over a lifetime, remain static in his thinking. This would seem to be a fairly obvious point, but Shawcross demonstrates, again and again, that it is a point that has been missed by most Miltonists.

William Shullenberger. *Lady in the Labyrinth: Milton's Comus as Initiation*. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2008. 361 pp. \$65.00. Review by MITCHELL M. HARRIS, AUGUSTANA COLLEGE (SIOUX FALLS).

When I was an undergraduate student, Milton's *A Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle*, or *Comus*, felt like a bothersome obstacle standing between us students and the poet's great epic. It was something we *had* to read but did not necessarily *want* to read, and this sentiment never really disappeared during my graduate school years. In my mind, Milton was not merely a writer of epic. He himself was epic. To read his earlier works and short poems was, then, to shatter the illusion and mystique of the epic Milton. And this was the last thing my fawning mind wanted to do. Now, having had the opportunity to teach Milton courses of my own, I find myself uniquely attracted to *Comus* in ways I never could have anticipated even a few years ago. No longer does the *Maske* feel like an obstacle to the epic Milton, but rather an intimate invitation to him. In *Comus* one sees the younger poet fleshing out his dialogues, a feature that is prominent and essential to his "great works." One also encounters, to borrow from Julia Walker, Milton's "idea of woman," as well as scenes of temptation and defiant acts of violence and heroism. There is, then, in *Comus* all the features of the "great works," which makes it all the more surprising that it has been over twenty-five years since the last major book-length study on *Comus*, Maryann Cale McGuire's *Milton's Puritan Masque* (1983), was published—that is, at least until William Shullenberger recently entered the stage with his delightful and compelling *Lady in the Labyrinth: Milton's Comus as Initiation*.

In *Lady in the Labyrinth*, Shullenberger begins with a simple, yet often overlooked, insight regarding *Comus*, thus establishing its unique distance from the typical court mask of the Tudor and Stuart reigns. *Comus*, he reminds us, "is not only representational, but performative" (15). In its representational function, it celebrates the Earl of Bridgewater's "ceremonial accession to the seat of a political and judicial authority already invested in him" (15). In its performative function, however, it "makes his daughter something she wasn't before the *Maske's* performance" (15). Thus, *Comus* "ritually accomplishes" the "pas-

sage from girlhood into womanhood” for a specific young woman, Alice Egerton, the Earl’s fifteen-year-old daughter, who played the role of “The Lady” at its Ludlow performance in September of 1634.

While Shullenberger never explicitly seeks to get caught up in the historical, material, and biographical minutiae of Milton, the Egerton family, or their milieu, the lived reality of Alice Egerton is never far from his mind. In fact, her rite of initiation acts as the motivating force behind the entire monograph. As Shullenberger puts it, in “initiating Alice,” Milton’s *Maske* “reconfigures the cultural image and idea of womanhood that she incarnates and reconfigures mythical and psychological templates for this vital cultural formation” (16-17). And it is these very images, ideas, and templates that he wants to follow to their farthest ends. Thus, *The Lady and the Labyrinth* never establishes a performative agenda of its own. It never asserts a unified narrative, because such a narrative could potentially prohibit its author from asking the very questions he wants to ask. He therefore executes an “investigatory criticism,” one that “enters the text with more questions than conclusions and lets the drift of the question determine the movement of a claim” (33). As Shullenberger himself confesses, even as *The Lady in the Labyrinth* “pushes toward thematic coherence”—“something of strange constancy”—it entertains “multiple points of entry” (33). Indeed, this is, I would argue, one of its greatest strengths, the very essence of what makes the book such a compelling read.

Chapter one, “‘Growing a Girl’: The Masque of Passage,” examines what Shullenberger identifies as *Comus*’s two ritual paradigms—“time-honored rites of passage for girls” and “the masques that staged and celebrated monarchic power and aristocratic virtue in Stuart England” (35). Ultimately, he argues that Milton takes a (re)visionary stand in such arenas: aristocratic virtue is explicitly called into question and virtue itself is feminized. Chapter two, “Singing Master of the Soul: The Attendant Spirit,” turns to the complex role of the Attendant Spirit, who he views as the initiatory rite’s master of ceremonies. The third chapter, “Tragedy in Translation,” investigates what one could term the textual nature of the Lady’s opening soliloquy, demonstrating its expressed distance from the genre of the court masque, which never establishes something as dramatically rich as the Lady’s self-recognition process. Chapter four, “Double

Trouble: Comus and His Bloodlines,” argues for the bipolarity of Comus’s character. As the son of Bacchus and Circe, Comus forces the Lady to confront both a Dionysian threat and a “perhaps more subtle threat of regression and dissolution” in Circe, while establishing her own subjectivity (39). “Girl Power: The Profession of Virginity,” the fifth chapter, is perhaps one of the most compelling chapters one encounters. As Shullenberger explains it in his introduction, he argues that the Lady translates “medieval notions of magical celibacy as a fugitive and cloistered virtue into a reformation exercise of chastity as virginity’s being toward the world, an activist virtue engaged in critical argument, self-transcendence, and world transformation” (39). Chapter six, “Milton’s Lady and Lady Milton,” turns to the oft-noted connection between “the Lady” and the university student who was Milton: “the Lady” of Christ’s College. Shullenberger declares here that chastity becomes “the gender crossroad where Milton discovers and exercises his own prophetic speech” (203). The final chapters, “Girl, Interrupted and Changing Woman” and “Homecoming Queen,” focus upon the “puzzling focal points of stasis and silence” that we see embedded in the role of the Lady in the final moments of *Comus* (41).

The Lady in the Labyrinth is a long-awaited and, I would argue, much-needed addition within the realm of Milton studies. No text is without its faults, and I am sure that some of its chapters will elicit strong reactions from its readers. In particular, I believe some will be resistant to the arguments Shullenberger makes in the closing chapters. I myself remain somewhat ambivalent about his claims here. On the one hand, Shullenberger offers a fresh alternative to the feminist narrative that condemns Milton’s silencing of the Lady at the end of *Comus*. On the other hand, the assertion that ritualistic initiatory rites are being played out often appears too universalist in its reach—too detached from the historical particulars of seventeenth-century England. Despite such ambivalent feelings about a couple chapters, I think most readers of *The Lady in the Labyrinth* will find it agreeable when I suggest that Shullenberger brings something fresh and compelling to the table. He has, indeed, helped me think through many of the reasons why it is that I now am so deeply fond of Milton’s *Maske* and why I am so deeply grateful that my professors never excised it from

their syllabi. If, as I believe, *Comus* is an invitation to the epic poet, then Shullenberger may be even more adamant. For him, the epic poet is already there, in the text of *Comus*, and *The Lady in the Labyrinth* does all it can—and all it should—to reveal this to its readers.

Margaret Olofson Thickstun. *Milton's Paradise Lost: Moral Education*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2007. xiv + 184 pp. \$65.00. Review by JAMES EGAN, THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON.

Thickstun notes that her discussions of *Paradise Lost* are “influenced as much by contemporary research in psychology and moral development as they are by current Milton scholarship” (ix), and she makes ample use of the work of Perry, Fowler, Noddings, McCullough, and others. Considered as literary criticism, *Milton's Paradise Lost* reads the epic as a text concerned with the “moral and psychological education of young people,” by which Thickstun means many of the poem’s major characters. This emphasis aligns her argument with post-1990s exploration of Milton’s pedagogy and the ways and means of the educational processes he dramatizes. Thickstun defends her emphasis on the literary study of moral questions as a means of not only heightening the emotional involvement necessary for contemporary readers to engage fully with *Paradise Lost*, but also as an antidote to what she considers the self-referential, abstract preoccupations of postmodern pedagogy. From this conceptual vantage point, she makes regular observations about the teachability of episodes and characterizations in the poem. Representative of Thickstun’s overall position are the chapters on God the Father, Satan, Adam, and Eve.

God, she argues, is better understood by the metaphor of parenthood than by the traditional metaphors of kingship or military precedence. God presents Himself in Scripture as a “loving, jealous, occasionally angry, feeling father” (23), and Milton’s construction of Him stresses the parental qualities of emotional investment, selflessness, and self-restraint. Thickstun valuably contextualizes Milton’s portrait of God in terms of contemporary Puritan ideas of fathering; in the process she frees the historical identity of Puritan fatherhood from stereotypical oversimplifications of it. Milton’s God considers

His creatures as individuals and, as part of His parenting, extends opportunities for personal growth even to Satan, whose treatment by God Thickstun interprets as the “tireless overtures of a caring parent,” a sort of “loving outreach” (33). Unconventionally but persuasively, she reads the interaction of God and Satan throughout the poem as a series of redemptive possibilities for the fallen angel, so that the story of Satan becomes open-ended rather than fixed. Her claim that the Satan-Sin conversation identifies him as a failed parent merits attention.

Chapter seven, “Adam as Parent,” examines the Adam-Eve relationship from the point of view that Adam is, first of all, Eve’s parent. When he asks for Eve, Adam sets in motion a complex series of responsibilities for her, including the responsibility for the welfare of another; such responsibilities, for developmental psychologists, define Adam’s “moral adulthood” (126). Adulthood takes shape as well through the elaborate pattern of interactions between Adam and Eve, interactions that cause Adam to accommodate another human perspective both independent of and dependent on him. Thickstun reads Adam’s desire for intimacy with Eve as a wish for emotional fellowship more than a craving for sensual pleasure. Adam’s anxiety at the thought of being separate from Eve grows primarily out of the intense sensations of fear and loneliness. As she makes these arguments, Thickstun dialogues effectively with the sizeable body of postmodern scholarship which addresses the relationships of the first parents. Chapter eight, “Eve, Identity, and Growing in Relationship,” studies the reciprocal relationship of Adam and Eve and Eve’s developmental responsibilities for Adam and the Garden. Thickstun concedes the conventional critical doubt about the adequacy of Adam’s reaction to Eve in the Separation Colloquy, but finally decides that Adam and Eve have reviewed “questions of liberty and responsibility, of Eve’s sufficiency and Satan’s duplicity” sufficiently to have “prepared Eve to resist temptation” (141). She points out that Eve has more than a little experience in recognizing evil, and as readers have noticed, Eve’s dialogue with Satan contains enough wit (and the processes of cognition which underlie wit) to suggest that she well understands just what Satan is proposing. The author’s evidence leads convincingly to

her conclusion that Eve is sufficient to have withstood temptation, and not a victim of divine manipulation.

The pedagogical implications of this reading of the epic are regularly mentioned: Galbraith Crump's *Approaches to Teaching Paradise Lost* (1986) is cited, and the author frequently invokes her typical audience of undergraduate, first-time readers of Milton. This pedagogical emphasis is a mixture of pluses and minuses. Thickstun objects to the anesthetizing effect certain critical methodologies have on first-time readers of *Paradise Lost*, self-referential methodologies preoccupied with their own inner workings, to the detriment of the actual text. Here she articulates a genuine problem encountered by teachers of the poem. In contrast, her readings enable a passionate involvement with the text in order to transcend barriers between it and students (10). These readings, stressing emotional investment in *Paradise Lost*, are meant to help students engage with the central moral questions Milton engages (13). Teachers of the epic to the kinds of students Thickstun references and possibly to other audiences will appreciate the pedagogical objectives she proposes and the obscuring and abstracting tendencies she objects to in Milton scholarship. It is important to note, however, that the pedagogical argument of this book poses several problems as well. Thickstun maintains that in order for students to become confident in their ability to read the epic, teachers may need to prepare study guides, language games, or map-making exercises (13), yet she provides none of the above herself. Had she offered a fully developed pedagogy in the form of lesson plans, writing assignments, or test questions, teachers could more easily measure the potential usefulness of such apparatus in comparison to their own strategies. In the hands of individuals other than the author, moreover, one wonders whether Thickstun's approach might cause as many student access problems as the ones she attributes to traditional postmodern pedagogies, even allowing for the success she has experienced with it. Because the pedagogical claims she makes have clinical implications, the burden of proof that her teaching access-routes are an improvement over others in play is on her; such proof cannot be anecdotal and might even need to be supported by data or studies of student writing and course evaluations. All of this is not to deny that *Milton's Paradise Lost* can work as a diary or a personal history, but to

underscore the complexities of modern pedagogy in general and the adaptive skills of individual teachers of the epic.

Shannon Miller. *Engendering the Fall: John Milton and Seventeenth-Century Women Writers*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008. viii + 280 pp. \$65.00. Review by LISA J. SCHNELL, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

In the blurb he contributed to the jacket, David Norbrook calls *Engendering the Fall* “an ambitious book.” It’s an equivocal phrase that registers my own equivocal response to Miller’s book. Yes, the book is very ambitious: it puts Milton into conversation with writers from almost the entire seventeenth century; it takes on the issue of influence, which is thorny at best; it engages in some of the biggest issues surrounding polity and science in the period; it rightly positions gender, and particularly the gendered narrative of the Garden, at the center of these seventeenth-century discourses. At the heart of the book is Miller’s desire to ascribe—some would say restore—to women a place in the early modern conversation around gender and governance. Filmer, Hobbes, Hooke, Locke: all figure highly in Miller’s discussion of that conversation. But so do Rachel Speght, Aemilia Lanyer, Elizabeth Poole, Lucy Hutchinson, Margaret Cavendish, Mary Chudleigh, Aphra Behn and Mary Astell. And at the center of it all is Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, radiating and refracting (one of the book’s most oft-repeated words) the “sustained cultural power of the figure of Eve” (4) both backwards and forwards from its post-Restoration spot in the seventeenth century.

The book is organized into three sections: Part I, called “Pretexts,” traces, through the early seventeenth-century’s *querelle des femmes* and some of the texts it spawned (Speght’s *Mortalities Memorandum* and Lanyer’s *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*), the emergence of innovative thinking about gender as a category of knowledge. Despite a lack of “irrefutable evidence,” Miller argues that because Milton was part of a community of readers in mid-century who read tracts like those in the *querelle*, the defenses of women by writers like Speght and Lanyer “constitute a field of context that Milton appears to have engaged in

his account of women's relation to the political realm and its relationship to the Fall" (74).

Part II, "Contexts," offers a thematic discussion of the "political imaginary generated through the events of the Civil War" and puts women into the conversation Milton and others were having about the consequences of the war. Female prophets at mid-century, Lucy Hutchinson during the Protectorate, and Margaret Cavendish during the Restoration all engage Milton (though almost certainly indirectly) in a conversation that revolves around gender, knowledge and governance. The Cavendish chapter, on knowledge and the "new" experimental science in her *Blazing World* (which takes on the Royal Society) and Milton's *Paradise Lost*, is perhaps the best chapter in the book. Miller's discussion of the ways in which scientific activities were linked to political patronage, activity and disruption is not new, but the justifiably central role she gives to Cavendish's text convincingly reveals the incontrovertible ways in which gender was also a part of that conversation, and that feels important, even importantly current (it's hard not to think about the current debates around stem cell research when reading this chapter).

Part III of the book, called "Influences," is—as its title acknowledges—the only part of the book that can unproblematically assert a standard definition of influence. Mary Chudleigh, Aphra Behn, and Mary Astell had all, without question, read *Paradise Lost*. In their respective treatments of the institution of marriage in the seventeenth century, all three make Milton's Eve central to their interpretations of the status of women in the period even while they, in conversation with their contemporary John Locke, negotiate a contractarian of view of the state that uses marriage as its primary analogy.

"What does observing these women as they are negotiated by or negotiate a republican thinker like Milton expose to our view?" asks Miller in her conclusion. "In part, it exposes the innovative ways these women imagined the structure of political organization and intersected this with improvisations upon gendered categories" (231). One of many critics doing this sort of work in early modern studies (several of whom do not show up in the book's otherwise extensive "Works Cited"), Miller's exposure of gender as a category of knowledge is not nearly as innovative as the work of the women innovators who

are her subjects. Yet, the book does do what Miller says it does, and there is no denying the importance of that work in our still-evolving understanding of the prominent role of gender in the cultural and political preoccupations of the English seventeenth century. The question, though, is: does *Engendering the Fall* do that work *well*?

The answer to that question gets back to the equivocal nature of that word “ambitious.” If one were to read only an individual chapter or two, the verdict might be that, though not particularly earth-shattering, Miller’s argument is sound and interesting, that it is an important contribution to the conversation around gender and politics in the seventeenth century. Taken as a whole, however, the book holds up less well. For, despite an introduction that attempts to rein in the book’s ambitions, it is difficult, once one gets to the end of the book, to say exactly what the book is about. Is this really a book about *Milton* and seventeenth-century women writers, as the subtitle announces, and as the book tries to insist again and again, or about a cultural narrative that informs the entire seventeenth century and that culminates in Lockean contractarian theory? On their surfaces, of course, the chapters seem centrally concerned with Milton, yet the entire book is haunted by, and concludes, albeit briefly, with Locke’s *Two Treatises*. Despite the length of the book (and the extremely small font), one feels that Miller’s argument is far from complete on the final page.

One might be willing to excuse such “ambition” if not for the fact that the book’s lack of genuine conceptual coherence is paralleled by its almost complete lack of editorial integrity. The examples of this are legion (and indeed far more extensive than any book review could document), and exist at every level. For starters, I do not remember ever being so distracted by lexical repetition in a scholarly book that I have actually started counting the number of times a single word shows up on a page (page 210: “thus”—six times in seventeen lines). As well, despite the fact that all six chapters are very long, only two chapters offer the hospitality provided by sub-headings. And even in those two chapters, the style of the sub-headings is completely and inexplicably different: in Chapter two, the headings are almost undifferentiated from the main text: same font, but in italics; in Chapter six, the headings are in bold (unitalicized) and in a larger font. In Chapter

five, on Margaret Cavendish and the Royal Society, Cavendish is confusingly said to value sense over reason in philosophy (144) despite the fact that Miller's central argument in the chapter is exactly the opposite: Cavendish values Cartesian reason over sense. Twenty-six pages into the Cavendish chapter, when Miller turns her attention to Milton, the following sentence shows up: "Even Margaret Cavendish, a strong and satirical voice against experimental philosophy and the practices it incorporates, titles her 1666 text *Observations upon Experimental Philosophy*, a clear indication, according to Judith Moore, that Cavendish perceived the growing market share of experimental philosophy when involving this specific meaning of 'experiment'" (162). After over twenty pages of learning exactly this about Cavendish, we surely do not need this introduction. One assumes the sentence is an artifact from a stand-alone essay on Milton's own sense of experiment; why it was not edited out of the book chapter is incomprehensible. Perhaps reviewers are the only ones who read a monograph cover to cover anymore, but surely for that reason alone, a press and an author should place some editorial priority on converting several discrete essays into a *book*. That there is scarcely any sign of those priorities here is much to the detriment of what might otherwise have been an unequivocally ambitious book.

Laura Lunger Knoppers, ed. *The Complete Works of John Milton: Volume II*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. civ + 170 pp. + 10 illus. \$135.00. Review by LARA M. CROWLEY, TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY.

The first volume to be published in the highly anticipated Oxford edition of Milton's works bases texts of *Paradise Regain'd* and *Samson Agonistes* upon the first printed edition of 1671, though editor Laura Lunger Knoppers asserts that the volume actually was printed in late 1670. Knoppers offers copious explanatory notes, which prove informative without imposing interpretation, and an introduction with an innovative focus on the poems' print event. Attending to recent critical interests, the editor focuses on political, religious, and bibliographic contexts for the 1671 and 1680 octavo editions, contributing much to our knowledge of publisher John Starkey and printer John

Macock while offering a glimpse into exegetical responses by early readers. While the introduction attends only briefly to Milton's literary invention, its emphasis on seventeenth-century production and reception of the poems affords fresh, timely insights alongside the beautifully formatted Oxford texts.

This meticulously prepared volume is the second of what will be eleven volumes in *The Complete Works of John Milton*, by General Editors Thomas N. Corns and Gordon Campbell, Textual Editor Archie Burnett, and a team of scholars from the United Kingdom, North America, and New Zealand. Knoppers outlines in brief her editorial procedures for this volume, which seem practical and appropriate, such as retaining original spelling and punctuation, except for occasional regularizations (like i/j and u/v) and expansions. The edition's text usually follows the 1671 copy-text, and changes indicated in the 1671 Errata are included in the text and indicated in the textual notes. Overarching editorial principles are not delineated in this volume of the series, but one might suppose that they will appear in Volume I: *Paradise Lost*.

The "General Introduction" is divided into four sections. The first section, "England in 1670-1671," builds upon recent scholarship on Milton's historical contexts, including Knoppers's own studies, such as *Historicizing Milton*. The editor attends primarily to tensions in 1670, when "opposition and discontent" lingered from Charles II's restoration a decade earlier, thanks to the court's wasteful spending, recent legislation on religion, and the English king's alliance with Louis XIV of France (xxi). Knoppers notes parliamentary bills and remarks made by Marvell and other figures "close to, or kindred spirits with, Milton" (xxi), in order to illuminate dissenting perspectives in this unsettled historical moment, looking beyond printed (and thereby public) accounts to personal responses.

The next section, "John Starkey and Radical Print in Restoration England," illustrates that, while Milton likely collaborated with the print house and booksellers, authorial intention and involvement were not the only factors to determine how these poems were presented to the public. Knoppers sheds light on the politically influenced careers of Starkey, the publisher, and of Macock, printer for the first and (according to Knoppers) the second editions. She emphasizes that

Starkey was known for his republican (and anti-Catholic) leanings by analyzing his other printed publications, such as James Harrington's incendiary 1660 tract outlining the tenets of an ideal republic, and scribal publications, including Starkey's seditious 1666-72 newsletters to Sir Willoughby Aston. As Annabel Patterson and others have shown, press censorship encouraged covert resistance in literature. Knoppers argues that Starkey and Macock offer clues to Starkey's informed clientele that oppositional opinions pervade these poems: even the act of including Starkey's seemingly radical catalogue of printed books in the 1680 edition place the poems in "a radical print context" (xlix). In addition, the fact that Starkey was an acknowledged radical "would have alerted the reader to political overtones of seemingly innocuous works, especially when combined with Milton's own notoriety" (xxxiv). According to Knoppers, Milton was likely aware of Starkey's republican reputation; she hints that Milton might have chosen Starkey as publisher of *Paradise Regain'd* and *Samson Agonistes* for this reason.

While revealing and highly suggestive, these two sections might have benefited from attention to debates regarding composition dates, an issue that the editor addresses later in the Headnote. Circumstances surrounding dissemination and reception of the poems certainly deserve the expert attention received here. But the significance of such issues for modern exegesis could be enhanced were we to ascertain that Milton was still composing, or at least revising, the poems in 1670-71. In the "Headnote," Knoppers eschews suggestions by Harris Francis Fletcher, William Riley Parker, and others that *Paradise Regain'd* was composed early, instead emphasizing contemporary remarks made by Edward Phillips, Milton's nephew who served as an amanuensis, and by Thomas Ellwood, whose role as Milton's "young protégé" she explores (xc). Knoppers concludes that *Paradise Regain'd* likely was composed "in the period after the plague and fire" (xcv) and that *Samson Agonistes* was composed after the Restoration, most likely in the period 1667-1670 (xcviii), making her focus on the socio-cultural dynamics of 1670 even more cogent.

A third introductory section, "'Verse, Epic, & Dramatic': Genre and Form in Restoration England," attends to Milton's choice of epic and tragic closet drama for his treatments of Christ's resistance

of temptation and of Samson's suffering and vengeance. Returning frequently to topical resonances, Knoppers analyzes scriptural and classical echoes while positing a rationale for literary imitation of various authors and work. She argues, for example, that, while *Paradise Regain'd* leans on epic conventions, the poem "is in many ways strikingly unlike both other biblical brief epics and classical antecedents," enabling Milton "to revise boldly the idea of the hero and the nation" (lii, liii). Thus, according to Knoppers, Milton's attention to the *Aeneid* attends to public perception that Virgil celebrated Augustus Caesar and the Roman empire: through portraying the Son as a "solitary, even solipsistic" hero whose "piety is not linked to the glory of his nation" (liii), the poem thwarts readers' generic expectations, instead subtly criticizing royal policies. One might argue instead that Milton imitates Virgil's own latent critiques of his contemporary leader's imperial project. Such added nuance would not necessarily compromise the editor's constructive claim for the epic mode of *Paradise Regain'd* as a vehicle for covert political satire.

"Early Readers and Marginalia," the final section, considers the poems' print context further by seeking explications made by readers immersed in this cultural moment, from which modern readers are distanced. Building upon scholarship by William H. Sherman, Heidi Brayman Hackel, and others, Knoppers analyzes marginalia and other early reader marks in copies of the 1671 and 1680 editions, arguing that "Like printers, publishers, and booksellers, Milton's early readers had an active role in the production of the material text and, by extension, in its meaning: both aesthetic and political" (lviii). She even identifies one probable early reader of the poems: Samuel Say (1676-1743), a dissenting minister. Although Knoppers concludes that Say's glosses prove surprisingly apolitical, she identifies in another 1671 volume bound with *Paradise Lost* (1674) what seem to be politically charged responses by an anonymous early reader. The editor argues that handwritten indexes for this volume seem to link "Restoration England with the Israel of Judges" (lxx). An image of the index is among the figures provided, which also include title pages and portraits.

The Textual Introduction and Headnote convey Knoppers's admirable labor as editor: she has collated seventeen copies of the 1671 edition and five copies of the 1680 edition, aided by a Comet

portable collator, in addition to examining numerous other copies for textual features and marginalia. The editor also attends further to printing house practices, describing the much-debated *Omissa* and Errata (missing from the 1680 printing) and suggesting how material-text elements, such as the design of the title pages, can guide the reader toward particular (and often political) interpretations. In addition, Knoppers contends that previous scholarly attention to Milton's spelling seems injudicious when one considers that spelling practices frequently reflect compositors' idiosyncrasies, a perspective that variant spelling practices in various gatherings of the 1671 edition seem to corroborate.

The elegantly formatted texts of *Paradise Regain'd* and *Samson Agonistes* are accompanied by textual variants alone, with explanatory notes relegated to the concluding "Commentary." Classical and scriptural sources provide potential contexts and allusions, particularly for frequently echoed texts, and appropriate definitions and etymologies are offered for words likely to be unfamiliar to or misunderstood by modern audiences. The learning displayed in Knoppers's commentary reflects Milton's own. These compendious notes will prove valuable to Milton scholars and to readers coming to Milton's poems for the first time.

Undoubtedly, this edition of *Paradise Regain'd* and *Samson Agonistes* will (quite rightly) become the standard edition for seventeenth-century scholars. And Knoppers's illumination of circumstances related to the production and reception of these poems within their contemporary contexts will afford valuable avenues for critical inquiry. I eagerly await the next Oxford volume.

Gary Kuchar. *The Poetry of Religious Sorrow in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. xii + 242 pp. \$99.00. Review by P. G. STANWOOD, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

The opening sentence of this book anticipates well what follows in the long introduction and the six chapters, which really are discrete essays loosely and tendentiously bound together: "Christianity is

nothing if not a vast technology of mourning” (1). Yet the curiously inappropriate word choice is descriptive of the way in which this study unfolds, for the reader confronts a “technology” of complicated interrelationships of wheels within wheels. Early modern religious poets are, indeed, often concerned with grief, sorrow, and tears; they try with heavy effort to express these concerns while also interpreting them. Religious sorrow is “doctrinally charged”; poets who write of sorrow reveal their theological beliefs, we are told, and also their connection to a path well trodden by earlier practitioners in the mode of grief.

Gary Kuchar is a sensitive and subtle critic who moves easily between the Magisterial reformers and the post-Tridentine Catholic response of the Counter Reformation as he seeks to sort out the Christian experience of godly sorrow “as a medium of communication between the human and the divine” (25). The first chapter discusses Robert Southwell and his influential *St. Peters Complaint*, with Shakespeare’s *Richard II* and Milton’s Satan as the principal beneficiaries. Kuchar writes particularly well of “the sighs and tears” that lead from Southwell’s *Complaint* to Richard and Satan, who provide a testament to the literary promise of the tradition that Southwell popularized. Subsequent chapters deal with Richard Crashaw’s “The Weeper”; Andrew Marvell’s “Eyes and Tears”; Amelia Lanier’s *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*; and two final chapters on Donne: one on the *Holy Sonnets*, the other on *An Anatomy of the World. The First Anniversary*. Kuchar moves from close textual analysis to large critical formulations in all of these carefully chosen examples. While George Herbert is not given a chapter to himself, his poetry, particularly “Grief,” nevertheless figures prominently throughout much of the argument in the book.

“Compunction” is key to Kuchar’s thesis. Contrition, remorse, the “pricking of conscience,” pulls strongly in one direction, and despair in the other. The motion between these poles or opposing ways provides “the basic dialectic” of the book, which Kuchar discloses in the several poems he carefully meditates. But this is not an easy book to summarize adequately, for it does not develop systematically. Rather, the author approaches his general theme from a variety of independent authorities whose actions might converge, but only with strong insistence. Many excellent insights occur throughout the book, yet often unclearly related to each other, and sometimes not always clear

in their specific context. Of Crashaw's depiction of the Magdalene's tears ("O cheeks! Bedds of chast loves / . . . O wit of love!"), Kuchar writes of what he sees as a "dialectical tension" which is resolved "in a way that sustains the phenomenological principle that Magdalene's face presents a saturation of meaning that is in excess of being absorbed by cognition" (94). The relationship between Marvell's "Eyes and Tears," Crashaw's poem, and *Richard II* is offered in arresting but obscure terms: "Insofar as Marvell's anamorphic tears disclose the simultaneous continuity and discontinuity between temporal and eternal orders, they stand between the hypostatic vision of Neoplatonic transcendence voiced in "The Weeper" and the skeptically tragic view of existence expressed by Shakespeare" (120).

The following chapter (essentially an independent essay) turns from Mary Magdalene to the Virgin Mary, whom Aemilia Lanyer portrays with poetic and priestly authority. Her "swooning" depicts, Kuchar urges, "an active role that provides theological and iconographical authority for Lanyer's own reclamation of a quasi-priestly power" (144). Lanyer significantly places Mary in a medieval tradition, "at the center of a religious regime that is destructively asymptotic in nature" (145). Kuchar quotes from Lancelot Andrewes (whose name is consistently misspelled), out of context, in order to give an example of a late Reformation sensibility that feels Mary's sorrow with less intensity. But the point is not well made; at the very least, more proof is necessary from Andrewes's vast homiletic works.

Kuchar studies Donne's *Holy Sonnets* selectively in his by now familiar theoretical fashion, which he often conveys in theological terms. "Negative Love," one of the *Songs and Sonets*, shows how Petrarchism may be parodied. In this poem Donne applies "the apophatic principles of negative theology to woman rather than to God. . . . [I]he poem appears as a sincere application of Neoplatonic apophaticism to the context of secular love; from a second perspective, the poem appears as an obscenely solipsistic retreat into onself" (158). Somehow the achievement of this poem anticipates, or complements "O might those sighes and teares" (*Holy Sonnet 3*), where the speaker is fraught with Petrarchan anguish because he is trying to evade "the double-edged sword of the Word in the very gesture of asking to be healed by it" (164). One feels a brief moment of recognition and insight

(with the unusual invoking of the apophatic tradition that stresses the unknowability of God); but this reading of the sonnet puts a familiar idea into unnecessary accoutrements.

The final chapter on Donne's *First Anniversary* (its companion, *The Second Anniversary*, is not mentioned), like the previous chapter on the *Holy Sonnets*, stands on its own, having little direct connection with the rest of the book. Kuchar argues, not very convincingly, that the death of Elizabeth Drury relates to "cultural anxiety regarding original sin and the precise mechanism of grace believed to resolve it that is in question in the Reformation" (193). Donne, it appears, is engaged in a "process of working through the existential implications of doctrinal commitments [that take] place most often in the English Renaissance through the experience of grief . . . [registered] in the strange modality of overliving" (211)

Kuchar has written a remarkable but difficult collection of essays around the trope of "sorrow and grief." He moves fluently in a wide range of literature, theology, and contemporary critical theory, and in all of these areas, he is widely read. But the book seems to be addressed to an extremely narrow and elite audience while nearly every paragraph contains a reference to a critic or commentator, often with quotation in the text or in a note. Awkward, frequently obscure statements will commonly lead to a final sentence in the paragraph beginning "In short . . .," which is seldom a satisfactory summary of what has preceded. Certain terms become talismanic: "soteriological"; "desacralization" (in various forms); "apophatic"; "sacramental"; "icastic"; and so on. Notes, numbering altogether over 400, are gathered at the end of each chapter. There is no bibliography, but a full index. Nevertheless, in spite of some reservations about this book, one admires its scholarship and the brilliance of Kuchar's ingenuity and determination in bringing together so many diverse strands into one overarching motif.

Alison Shell. *Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. xiv + 244 pp. \$95.00. Review by ROBERT LANDRUM, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA BEAUFORT.

In *Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England* Alison Shell assigns herself an ambitious task, to assess the impact of post-Reformation Catholicism on England's oral culture. It is an investigation of a persecuted and deliberately opaque subculture through the use of notoriously shifting and obscure sources, made all the more difficult by the demands of a divided audience. Herself a reader in Literature at the University of Durham, Shell's book is crafted to appeal not just to her literary colleagues, but also to early modern historians, brought to the topic by renewed interest in Catholic survivalism. Given these challenges of readership and topic, *Oral Culture* is a successful book. Shell's archival work is impressive, her use of sources is imaginative and revealing, and her conclusions will be useful to scholars in multiple disciplines.

Oral Culture begins with the sacrilege narratives that emerged from the Henrician Reformation, showing how the spoiled abbeys and "bare ruined choirs" inspired a folk and print tradition of reverence for the old faith even among adherents of the new. The book then progresses in separate chapters through spells and other folklore, and competing Protestant and Catholic martyr traditions, citing survivals to the present. Most impressive is the discussion of controversial literature, whereby print-based Protestants contended against orally-based Catholics to buttress the faith of believers and sway the uncommitted.

Among the accomplishments of this book the most impressive may be the breadth of Shell's sources. She convincingly demonstrates how orally transmitted works can be derived from the dark corners of the documentary past. Among these are ballads and sung verse, libels and martyr-tales, ghost stories and sacrilege narratives, all circulated orally before being brought to print by conservative antiquarians like John Aubrey, who valued them as evidence of a vanishing English past. This pursuit of non-canonical sources necessarily requires non-canonical research in a host of archives. The latter are revealed by a close inspection of the notes because, unfortunately, the book lacks a formal bibliography.

Shell's command of the sources is commendable, as is her firm determination to consider those sources in the context of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. She explicitly aligns herself with the new historicists (though never claiming membership among them) and profits from the work of a constellation of named historians. She repeatedly refuses to adopt a single theoretical foundation, and is openly critical of "a grim period when practitioners of sub-Foucauldian body-scholarship tried their best to dehumanize the martyrs of the Reformation" (114). Though scholars of literature might object, this reticence is appropriate, since the style, means, content and format of the sources is determined by their very specific English and confessional and chronological contexts

One of the assumptions of Protestant pamphleteers and modern readers is that oral tradition can be equated with illiterate tradition. Shell demonstrates that this is not the case. Oral culture spanned socioeconomic gaps, and was not restricted to the ignorant or the poor. The tradition aimed for a "wide audience which included the unlettered" but was not limited to them (86). The resort to oral transmission was often a conscious choice of medium, based on its advantages. Shell urges caution, however, warning that oral literature does not represent an "unproblematic access to the popular voice" so much as an elite attempt to "popularize dissident ideas" (19, 82). If, as is commonly assumed, Protestants adopted print culture as their own, oral culture remained a contested no-man's-land, one where Catholics had significant advantages. Protestant pamphlets, for example, could be answered in ballads, which would themselves be answered in manuscript, which would be contested through libels.

The promise of this largely successful book is compromised, however, as it approaches a conclusion. After a Tridentine defense of oral tradition as opposed to written records, Shell concedes the problematic nature of her sources, composed by one voice and transmitted by others until frozen in their ongoing evolution in the act of written publication. Her response is to prescribe appropriate care in the use of orality, but also to challenge the significance of factuality. "Truth" she says, "is not necessarily absent ... if one broadens one's definition of it into considerations of diversity and emotional authenticity: an area where minority groups, Catholics and

others, have special demands on a compassionate reader's attention" (150). This is a generous sentiment, one that might appeal to those for whom the text in the present is more important than the time it illuminates, but it will undoubtedly make some historians wince. She then summons the same post-structuralists whom she denigrates in the introduction to call into question the veracity of written evidence. In the end she accepts the inherent limits of oral tradition with an unsatisfying literary truism: "questions of truth are not the same as questions of accuracy" (151).

Shell's conclusions, after the unconvincing challenge to factual certainty, are reasonable and modest. "Orally transmissible material" she says, can legitimately be used as "a rich source of views held about Catholicism in early modern England, and as a key means of Catholic self-definition." This is followed by the equally unobjectionable: "oral traditions were a crucial means of preserving Catholic matter in post-Reformation England" (169). More than this, Catholic oral traditions illuminate the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century struggle of faiths in a way that the purely written record does not. The presence of a vigorous Catholic oral culture argues, as do several of Shell's cited historians, for the vigor and vitality of the faith, even as official repression intensified. For this contribution, and for the sources she has brought into the light and into the scholarly conversation, *Oral Culture and Catholicism in Early Modern England* is an important and largely successful book.

Elena Levy-Navarro, *The Culture of Obesity in Early and Late Modernity: Body Image in Shakespeare, Jonson, Middleton, and Skelton*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008. 238 pp. \$80.00. Review by GARY KUCHAR, UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA.

Elena Levy-Navarro's *The Culture of Obesity* deploys the insights and strategies of queer and feminist theory in order to narrate a history of the fat body from the late Middle Ages to the present. The aim of the book is avowedly activist: Levy-Navarro intends her history "to intervene in our historical moment by viewing this moment through the early modern period" (1-2). The ultimate goal of this

history is to encourage us “to place ourselves with [fat bodies] rather than against them” (19). More precisely, the purpose of the book is to leverage early modern literature and cultural analysis against what Levy-Navarro diagnoses as our current, and in her view, thoroughly pathological, “fat panic” (1). In pursuing this end, the argument takes some very ambitious turns, including a critique of historical and scientific objectivity and an attack on the linear conceptions of time apparently informing our current revulsion of fatness and our corollary obsession with thinness. In short, this is a book for those who wish to see Falstaff win out over Hal.

The book divides into six chapters, moving from a polemical introduction to readings of *Piers Plowman*, Skelton’s *Elynour Rummyngge*, Shakespeare’s *Henry IV* parts I and II, Middleton’s *A Game At Chess*, and Ben Jonson. Chapter one, “Toward a Constructionist Fat History,” sets the stage for the argument by analyzing some of the moralizing hyperbole deployed in influential (contemporary North American) scientific studies of obesity. Levy-Navarro focuses particular attention on the tendency in our current “representational regime” to describe obesity as a pandemic analogous to “the worst cataclysms of human history, whether that be the Black Death, the HIV/AIDS epidemic, the 2001 terrorist attacks” or other events of a similar scale (3). It is clear from the various studies Levy-Navarro adduces that our current attitudes towards fat are not constituted by value-neutral, strictly objective analyses, but are built on culturally and historically mediated anxieties that have yet to be fully grasped. Not surprisingly, however, Levy-Navarro’s demonstration of this point is more effective when she is exposing the ideological assumptions behind our culture’s hyperbole about fatness than when she critiques the scientific validity of particular studies. Perhaps the least satisfying feature of Chapter one is its championing of the mystifying, and ultimately teleological, vision of Christian figurality in order to establish “a history that self-consciously thwarts the regulatory imperative apparent in modern, teleological history” (24). The logic of this move is, at best, unclear, at worst, incoherent.

Chapter two, “A Time Before Fat? Gluttony in *Piers Plowman*,” begins by provocatively arguing that the obese body, understood as “an individualized, self-contained object, which is seen as being

violated by fat flesh” did not exist in the premodern period (36). It is only with the rise of a “civilized elite”—a small group of arrivistes,” Levy-Navarro argues, that our modern representational regime of obesity emerged out of the “time before fat” (31). The argument here is almost exactly analogous to Foucault’s claims about “homosexuality” as an historically emergent category and Levy-Navarro says as much. By following Foucault in this way, Levy-Navarro argues that the differences between premodern and modern bodily regimes are bald differences of kind. Despite this simplification of what is surely a more complex phenomenon, she makes an interesting case that the fat body becomes increasingly “marked, stigmatized, and understood to be the emblem of our collective excess” (30). This argument involves some helpful distinctions, made in reference to *Piers Plowman*, between obesity and slothfulness, physical fatness and spiritual-moral gluttony.

Chapter three, “Emergence of Fatness Defiant: Skelton at Court,” interprets *Elynour Rummyng* as a criticism of the civilizing aesthetic of the emerging renaissance elite, a work that is in sympathy with the “outrageous bodily aesthetic” of the poem’s tavern-women (46). Levy-Navarro concludes her reading by asking, “might we not align ourselves with the aesthetic of the tavern against the petty aesthetic of the courtier simply because the former is perhaps more fun?” thereby reversing the value-system of the court-elites (65). Although such an argument raises familiar questions about the legitimacy of reversal as a subversive strategy, the book does not take such questions into account. Nor does chapter two’s discussion of the anti-court aesthetic involve consideration of poetic form—resulting in an exclusively thematic and somewhat unsatisfying reading.

Chapter four, “Lean And Mean: Shakespeare’s Criticism Of Thin Privilege,” offers an interpretation of the Henry IV plays that should be of real value in today’s classrooms. In it, Levy-Navarro shows how “Shakespeare underscores the predatory aspect of the new bodily aesthetic, [an aesthetic] which consumes certain bodies even as it shores up the power of the new civilized elite” (68-69). In Levy-Navarro’s hands, the Henry IV plays become sites in which the future of fat is envisioned even as it is powerfully critiqued. While Levy-Navarro views Shakespeare as an astute critic of an unethical

and distinctly modern thin-regime, she castigates Middleton's *A Game Of Chess* for exemplifying the Calvinist dimensions of such a regime. Focusing on the Fat Bishop of Middleton's play, Chapter five makes a persuasive case that anti-Catholic polemic in the period helped bolster what would become our contemporary bourgeois sense of revulsion towards fatness.

The book concludes by implicating readers into its argument as Levy-Navarro leads us to ask, with Ben Jonson, "Do you want to live in a world of dead objects, weighed and measured by an objective system of measurement, or do you want to live in a world where objects, things, and even bodies are animated by a lively human judgment? Are you going to be . . . a merchant, a superficial courtier, or a friend?" (149). This strategy of formulating questions which presuppose their own answers is indicative of the book's polemical ends, not to mention its relentlessly indignant tone—a tone that matches the hyperbolic moralism of our current "fat regime" toe-for-toe.

While this book is timely, and while it should be of real use in the classroom, its polemical aims tend to result in narrowly construed readings of multifaceted literary texts. And although cultural critics who are sympathetic with the book's assumptions and aims may find the moralistic tone appropriate, other readers, particularly those most in need of being persuaded, likely will not. Despite Levy-Navarro's stated aims, when it comes to the book's own rhetorical effects, Falstaffian exuberance loses out to a species of Foucauldian puritanism. That said, the book's demonstration of how fat bodies are marked in early and late modernity, over and against unmarked thin bodies, is valuable and challenging. Because such arguments have the ability to make a real difference in readers' lives, especially, I would think, in the lives of young readers, Levy-Navarro's book deserves to be engaged, however cautiously.

Theresa DiPasquale. *Refiguring the Sacred Feminine: The Poems of John Donne, Aemilia Lanyer, and John Milton*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2008. xiii + 392 pp. \$60.00. Review by JUDITH SCHERER HERZ, CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL.

Concentrating on the figure of Wisdom in *Proverbs*, the *Song of Solomon*, the deuterocanonical *Ecclesiasticus* and the *Wisdom of Solomon*, and, as well, on the figure of Mary in *Luke* and of Ecclesia in the Pauline epistles, this study examines crucial texts in the writings of Donne, Lanyer, and Milton as each “portrays the feminine as a reflection of the divine, and woman . . . as an agent of redemption or conduit of grace” (2). All three, it is argued, find in Mary an inspiration for their poetic practice. Indeed the entire study is founded on a deeply felt and nuanced Christian feminism.

The aim is to examine each writer in the light cast by the examination of the other two. To a degree this happens in the occasional phrase—like Milton, unlike Donne—but essentially these are three separate studies, which do not always, at least for this reader, usefully comment on each other. I say this in part, because while the Donne section works particularly well and is genuinely illuminating and often original, the other two, especially the Milton section, make this thematic thread blur too many important differences. However, it is not the reviewer’s task to offer her Lanyer or her Milton but rather to lay out the argument on offer, and it is an important argument that carefully positions itself in relation to the scholarly and critical literature. DiPasquale knows the theological materials and the critical debates exceptionally well, engaging them with tact and insight. And it is well written with some neat turns of phrase (I particularly like the description of the sonnet as a 14 line wooing apparatus).

The Donne section begins with a close examination of a little studied text, “The Annunciation and the Passion,” offering an original reading in relation to Donne’s idiosyncratic fusion of Roman Catholic and reformed theology: “the virgin mother and the soul who is both her daughter and her reflection . . . are, so to speak, the first and second persons of an earthly feminine triad” (29). Although Donne is still some years away from ordination, DiPasquale makes clear how this text intimates what his theological goal as priest in the

English church will be. This is followed by an examination of two holy sonnets, "Since she..." and "Show me deare Christ." The first reading works with Anne as mortal sacrament defined in conjugal terms. The emphasis is on Anne's pregnancies, her death, and Donne's complex position in a marriage "where his soul remained fleshly and procreation meant death" (42). In "Show me deare Christ," she uses both *Proverbs* and St. Augustine to tackle the sonnet's problematic conclusion, offering a reading that emphasizes the "potential scandal of Donne as irresolute Protestant" (63). The concluding sections on the *Anniversaries* go over much familiar material, but with an original emphasis on the "idea of woman" that Elizabeth Drury figures, reading it as both "counterpoint and antidote to the dark ironies of fallen gender relations" (83). She argues that both poems show how difficult it was for Donne to forgo Marian devotion.

The Lanyer section is set up in contrast to the Donne insofar as Lanyer's stance is explicitly anti-Jacobean in its view of the corruption of James's court and in its address to Margaret Clifford who had detached herself from that court to lead a celibate life. The *Salve Deus* is read, in part, as a critique of Christian marriage "as it was really experienced by Jacobean noblewomen," which gives a particular edge to the text's emphasis on Christ as "the ultimate . . . object of woman's desire" (163). Womanly virtue is understood as a force that unites human nature with the divine. Woman is understood as *Ecclesia* incarnate and this figure underwrites the emphasis on the feminized, eroticized body of Christ in the text, to say nothing of the depiction there of the various male martyrs. As with the Donne readings, these are in productive dialogue with those scholars who have written on the poem. As well, she works with the homoerotic readings of several critics, linking Lanyer's "love of a feminized Christ [to] . . . her love of and desire for other women" (198). This is not the place to engage such readings other than to say that I have always found that they too readily confound desire for patronage with desire *tout court*. A class analysis is broached here but not elaborated, although there is a nice reading of that purloined kiss at the end that unites both approaches.

The Milton section moves from *Arcades* to *A Mask to Paradise Lost* to *Paradise Regained*, much to cover in 100 pages. Milton is seen as offering a "non conformist Christian Humanist version of the

sacred feminine that is uniquely his own” (216). In DiPasquale’s reading of *Arctades*, “Maternal Wisdom and Pastoral Ministry,” the emphasis is on the dowager Countess as she figures both the ancient mother goddess and the Wisdom of Solomon. In the *Mask* section (“Ecclesiastical Discipline and Virginal Wisdom”), it is on the Lady as a type of the church and as the bride in the *Song of Solomon*. The working through of the Kerrigan/Leonard/Shuger discussions of the gums of glutinous heat is nicely done. The conclusion that follows, however, that virtue is both free and feeble, does not really require the apparatus invoked. Similarly with *Paradise Lost* where Eve is positioned as a Wisdom figure, there is interesting local reading even if the overall approach is too “orthodox” for my taste. The implicit equation: Raphael as narrator surrogate equals the narrator as a necessarily trustworthy figure who equals Milton in a straightforward way seems to me constantly contradicted by the experience of the text. As with Dennis Danielson, whom she quotes, there is too much emphasis on what Adam *ought* to have done. The text certainly asserts “ought” but it enacts a far more complicated “is.” Still the parallels drawn between Eve and Sapientia as they lead to Eve’s echoes of divine Wisdom’s self-sacrificial love and to Mary as the second Eve helpfully conclude this section. The last section on *Paradise Regained* develops the arguments of both Dayton Haskins and John Rumrich. It focuses these through an important question: why the conclusion, why the last line: “home to his mother’s house private he return’d”? The answer examines the feminine dimension of Jesus, reading the son as student of Mary, the return tempering “Milton’s heroic portrait of the Messiah as masculine victor” (300).

Whether one’s interest is on the sacred feminine as figure, as ideal, as organizing principle or on these writers and their texts in relation to various interpretive agendas, this study offers useful materials with which to frame one’s questions and to look for some answers.

P.G. Stanwood. *John Donne and the Line of Wit: From Metaphysical to Modernist*. Vancouver: Ronsdale Press, 2008. 42 pp. + 8 illus. \$9.95.
 Review by MITCHELL M. HARRIS, AUGUSTANA COLLEGE (SIOUX FALLS).

The first time I was introduced to Paul Stanwood was at a John Donne Society conference about five years ago. Despite being one of the hundreds of graduate students I am sure he has met on such occasions, I never was made to feel as if I were a bothersome addition to his already demanding schedule. While standing in line at a dinner buffet, he politely introduced himself, and then quickly inquired about my research interests, asking probing questions about my then nascent dissertation. Never during this conversation was there a hint of condescension—of the wise master trying to whip the young pupil into shape. Professor Stanwood received my ideas with what seemed to be a genuine interest throughout the course of the entire dinner evening, kindly offering suggestions that might be of great benefit to me. He was both gracious and reassuring. While I cannot speak for Professor Stanwood, I am sure a part of his willingness to talk to a young graduate student throughout the course of an evening in which he could have been reconnecting with good friends and colleagues already established in the field was that the conversation with a young graduate student gave him one more occasion to experience the joy of discussing John Donne, the other “metaphysical” poets, and the deep history of the scholarly work surrounding them. I remember walking away from that dinner conversation thinking that all graduate students should be so lucky as to meet a Paul Stanwood on such occasions.

And if ever a book could come close to capturing such an experience, it would be Stanwood’s pithy *John Donne and the Line of Wit: From Metaphysical to Modernist*. Here, he maintains much of the conversational tone used in the 2008 Garnett Sedgewick Memorial Lecture—the lecture resulting in this short monograph—at the University of British Columbia. Stanwood sets out to demonstrate, in his words, “how Donne’s legacy affected his own time but also how it helped to distinguish another time, much closer to us” (11). This legacy, he maintains while borrowing from “F. R. Leavis’s fortunate phrase,” is “the line of wit” (11). If Donne is to be considered a witty poet, then Stanwood’s task is to eloquently and cogently articulate the very

meaning of wit and show his readers how those of Donne's time were drawn to it and, subsequently, how it came to have a lasting impact on modernity. This is no small task, and that Stanwood delivers on his promise in roughly thirty pages is a marvelous feat.

He begins by reminding his readers that the term "metaphysical" was first used disparagingly, if not derisively, by John Dryden to describe a number of poets from the early seventeenth century. Yet Stanwood is quick to point out that Dryden's own thoughts on wit and "metaphysical" poetry were, in some ways, self-contradictory—that is, when Dryden argued that "The composition of all Poems is or ought to be of wit" (qtd. in Stanwood 12), he was partly defining "what we have usually come to recognize as the necessary constituent of metaphysical poetry" (12). Indeed, if there was a revolt against metaphysical wit in the eighteenth century, it was not necessarily a revolt against that which was expressed by Donne. Stanwood reminds his readers that Dr. Johnson's chief objections to metaphysical poetry were largely based upon examples "of false wit" that he culled from Cowley, "and they prove not so much the general inadequacy of the metaphysical poets as the ineptness of Cowley himself" (13). He thus focuses on those metaphysical wits who were celebrated in their time, but are largely forgotten in our own, thanks in much part to Dryden, Johnson, and Alexander Pope (but perhaps for good reason): Cowley, John Cleveland, and Edward (Lord Herbert of Cherbury).

After demonstrating how such wit deviated from Donne's, Stanwood goes on to show his readers that, while largely ignored during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Donne's "metaphysical" predilections and "line of wit" were given new life in the twentieth century, largely through the "pioneering efforts of H. J. C. Grierson" and the "oracular judgements of T. S. Eliot" (21). He then traces Donne's influence from Eliot to "the Fugitives,"—John Crowe Ransom, Robert Penn Warren, Allen Tate, "and like-minded writers, who for a time worked closely with one another" (23). Of course, most readers will better recognize the Fugitives as the "new critics." However, Stanwood does not focus on the critical work of the Fugitives, but rather their poetry and its close resemblances to Donne's "line of wit." Moreover, he demonstrates how Donne's legacy—vis-à-vis the Fugitives—continued to influence the early poetry of writers like Randall Jarrell, John

Berryman, and Robert Lowell during the twentieth century. And it is this very aspect of Stanwood's monograph that readers will most appreciate. After the explosion of theory and the rise of the culture wars, the new critics are largely remembered for their scholarship, not their poetry. Stanwood, however, gently refocuses our attention, reminding us of a story that is often no longer told, let alone heard.

Jennifer Summit. *Memory's Library: Medieval Books in Early Modern England*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008. x + 336 pp. + 8 illus. \$35.00. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL, THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH.

Jennifer Summit has done for the early modern English library what Anthony Grafton and Meagan Williams recently have done for the early Christian library of Caesarea. While their study explores the pioneering organizational bibliographic techniques of Origen and Eusebius later emulated by Jerome, Bede, and Erasmus, Summit focuses on the Reformation and how we are the inheritors of textual practices that developed between the two centuries bookended by Duke Humphrey and Robert Cotton. This painstaking study of the place of medieval manuscripts in the formation of the important libraries of England provides fresh insight into how primary sources have come down to us and gives us new ways to consider their origins.

While interest for readers of this journal initially may reside in Summit's treatment of Cotton's instrumentality in the generation of seventeenth-century prose and in Bacon's close connection to Thomas Bodley, there are many other insights to be found in the chapters leading up to her analysis of "premodern ideas about libraries as a place of active making" (237). Bacon, for example, is situated at the end of a long line of writers beginning with Lydgate and including More, Elyot, Spenser, and Camden, "for whom writing about libraries was a way of theorizing and imagining the objects, shapes, and limitations, of human knowledge" (201). Along the way we encounter a series of case studies that highlight the contributions of Higden, Stow, Speed, Weever, Selden, and Ussher. Throughout Summit scrupulously clarifies the extent to which libraries are to be considered narrative-producing

institutions, indeed “ideological lightning rods” (9). As such they symbolize the complex “place” of reading and writing in relation to a culture’s other institutions.

After all, as has long been acknowledged, much of what we know about medieval history and literary culture is due to Cotton’s assiduous amassing of original sources. What Summit shows us further is how Cotton actively was engaged in shaping that knowledge. The same applies to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, whose book donations led directly to the founding of Oxford’s library. Humphrey’s library was a place of active literary production, encouraging both the writing of new books and new ways of reading old ones. His patronage of Lydgate promoted the “larger effort to respond to a recent history of popular unrest and monarchical instability by reclaiming literacy as a tool of rulers over the ruled” (49). Humphrey combated Lollard actions and ideas on the field as well as in the library. Thus seeing more in Humphrey’s project than an effort to imitate the seigniorial libraries in Italy and treating him as being more than an influential appreciator of humanism, Summit demonstrates how his commissioning of a monk from Bury St. Edmunds, John Lydgate, to produce *The Fall of Princes* brings into focus the symbiosis of clerical literacy and secular authority which, in turn, was “mobilized for political ends by applying clerical literary practices” (29).

Apropos of this claim for mobilization, and given Summit’s careful attention to language in this jargon-free analysis of the English struggle to redefine the past by redefining the cultural place, function, and identity of libraries, it is not out of place to comment on her use of “ize” and “ization” suffixes. Indeed, it is worth recording some of the more stunning contentions articulated by means of “ize” and “ization” endings insofar as they can be read as emblematic encapsulations of the book’s fundamental aims. Doing so will bring out the main claims of this ambitious and well-researched study which succeeds in bridging, as the author announces in her introduction, “the bibliographical disciplines, particularly that of library history, and the disciplines of the academic humanities, particularly that of literary history” (5). Therefore the remaining quotations from *Memory’s Library* all contain uses of this suffix that turns nouns and adjectives

into verbs—and in Summit’s case they are verbs of action connoting transformational, often volatile, activity.

In her discussion of how the emergence of the early modern private library marked a paradigm shift in the social and cultural place of literacy, Summit argues that Thomas More “epitomized the laicization of literacy and its privileges” (53). As she goes on to observe astutely, this was an important precondition of English humanism. Her case studies include careful scrutiny of More’s *Life of Pico* and *Utopia*, as well as the interlibrary loans of Henry VIII’s chief minister and architect of the dissolution of the monasteries and the dispersion, sometimes, destruction, of their libraries, Thomas Cromwell, an “energetic patron of an Anglicanized active humanism” (79). Cromwell cultivated a coterie of educated laymen, most notably Starkey and Elyot, whose biblioclastic reforms she discusses in detail. For example, Summit adduces that Elyot’s famous *Dictionary*, created from the royal collections, resembles a library on many levels, especially in its use of an alphabetical order to structure the project and because licit and illicit sources are found side by side. Elyot’s efforts are seen as reflecting the larger Reformation challenge of imposing religious and political unity on the nation.

Summit also evinces a subtle argument for “the monasticization of the laity”; namely, that vernacular books of devotion had the effect of strengthening, rather than eroding, the monastery’s literary authority “by externalizing monastic models” (60). Far from seeing this as an organic or seamless flow of cultural influence though, it is figured as a battle between competing models of literacy and knowledge. The English library at the time of More, like his oeuvre, is more crucible than conduit.

The chapter on Spenser situates the poet as part of the circle of Matthew Parker, who was commissioned to catalogue surviving books from the former monastic libraries, and who gave nearly 600 books to Corpus Christi College when Spenser was a student at Cambridge. Spenser makes the library into a center of Protestant memory, a place where the past actively was remade. Summit’s treatment of the allegory of the turret in the Castle of Alma episode of *The Faerie Queene* clarifies that while Spenser’s library of Memory may recall the monastic library and scriptorium “it Protestantizes their memorial

function by banishing ‘visions, sooth-sayes, and prophesies’” to “the realm of imagination, classifying them under the rubric of ‘all that fained is, as leasings, tales, and lies’” (131). With the English library thus concerned more with castigating error than recovering positive knowledge, *The Faerie Queene* emerges, according to Summit, as the first work after the Reformation to be written for its shelves.

The seventeenth-century regard for the right ordering of knowledge, Summit contends, fueled a parallel development in nonfiction prose, a literary movement unthinkable without Robert Cotton. A compelling case is made that the Reformation project of desanctifying hagiography is “continued and advanced through Cotton’s archivization of medieval manuscripts” (172). Whereas Higdon’s *Polychronicon* ordered history in terms of six ages, the chronology organizing Cotton’s material “is based on a post-Reformation periodization that separates the medieval age of belief from the modern age of knowledge” (173). The Reformation thereby becomes a master narrative both of historical change and also a process of transformation that is carried out in the Cotton Library itself. The first users of that library generated protocols concerning the use of medieval manuscripts seen as truth bearing vessels, a view fundamental to much modern scholarship. And yet, as Summit shows, this was made possible only by readers engaged in active struggles with their sources, often effacing the original contexts and drastically altering the protocols of reading from which those manuscripts first drew their meaning. It is here that Summit goes into Cotton’s unbinding of manuscripts to reorganize them, sometimes deliberately cutting off later margin commentaries.

As with the manuscripts Cotton collected, so too the material artifacts, relics, and remains in his cabinet of curiosities which likewise were valued as objects of historical knowledge. Becket’s skull fragment, for example, no longer was an object of belief but a specimen in the history of belief. Camden’s skeptical and adversarial approach to documentary sources led him to strip away the fabulous accretions of miracle stories to reveal the solid ground of historical fact. In transforming hagiography into epitaph, he commemorates rather than sanctifies. The same holds for John Weever, “who proposes to replace Becket with Oldcastle, condemning the tomb of the former

(“this mocke-ape toy, this vaine alurement”) while calling for some ‘immortal verse’ to memorialize the latter’s ‘entombleth worth’” (183).

With nearly eighty pages of notes, despite the fifteen-page index, it is unfortunate that the choice was made not to include a bibliography—at least a list of the primary sources would have been welcomed. Still, *Memory’s Library* is a very important book that should be standard reading for scholars of literary and intellectual history. It establishes a critical agenda for studies in the history of the book for generations to come.

Bruce R. Smith. *The Key of Green: Passion and Perception in Renaissance Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009. v + 326 pp. + 55 illus. \$39.00. Review by IRA CLARK, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA.

The Key of Green “picks one of the locks that shut us off from the past. It gives us access to a surprisingly wide range of cultural experience on the other side, and like the coded key to a map it helps us interpret what we find there” (3). It extends to another sensory impression, Bruce R. Smith’s *The Acoustic World of Early Modern England*. The book, however, has ambitions beyond this thesis: hearing and especially seeing connote knowing, understanding, grasping, so that impression becomes apprehension, not reception but interaction. It elaborates on its precursor, exhorting us to witness a spectrum of colors, not only the black and white binaries of absorption and reflection of all colors. Green’s appeal for Smith lies in its boundlessness, its plenitude of related and antithetical meanings, its position between poles of the color spectrum. For him it becomes a “relationship” interpreters actively engage. Thus he urges interpreting philosophical, ethical, poetic, dramatic language as well as paintings, furnishings, gardens, landscapes through “green spectacles” just as he urges *Attending to the O-Factor*.

Admirably, Smith lays out presuppositions, frames, and intentions in his “Introduction: About Green.” *Passion and Perception in Renaissance Culture* constitutes a cultural history of material objects between 1575 and 1700 because Smith puts crucial emphasis on the shift he sees wrought by Descartes and Newton. The Cartesian shift

segregates an early-modern understanding that is more unifying, interactive, and sensory-impelled than the more analytic, receptive, intellectually binary one we have inherited. So Smith contrasts residual with emerging theories of *Perception*, a model expounded by Aristotle and early modern physicians with a model posited by Newton and subsequent cognitive theorists. One crucial distinction is the earlier sense of *Passion* as the impetus for cognition rather than our notion of it as a response to cognition. Moreover, Smith heeds the inconsistencies of thinkers, artists, and authors caught in the shift. So as to further our understanding of renaissance passionate perceptions he situates his book among others that examine space, time, and the indefinite relationships with our bodies rather than our dominant tendency to assign defining words to sites and situations; he would move us beyond the “linguistic turn” to an “affective turn” (5). He especially promotes attention to liminal space, the border ambience of elusiveness and transformation that he explores through “historical phenomenology,” seeking to understand how one knows based on one’s body interacting with material objects and subjects and explanations situated in their times.

Smith’s first chapter, “Light at 500-510 Nanometers and the Seventeenth-Century Crisis of Consciousness” repeatedly returns to Andrew Marvell’s “The Garden” and the contemplative Green Closet at Ham House, Surrey, in order to consider the puzzle and potential of green when the dominant western explanations of color shifted from Aristotelian to Newtonian. The spectrum shifted from black to white poles through four hues registering physical substances to our “roygbiv,” based on the eye’s reception of light rays. The effects of this shift are complexly registered through multiple discourses: metaphysics, physics, chemistry, botany, physiology, geometry, psychology, and climactically historical phenomenology. Chapter two, “Green Stuff” inventories and interprets materials from early modern England: household furnishings, climate, landscape, creatures and vegetation, dyes. It expands to interpretations of color and vision ever since Aristotle, including those alchemical and Galenic. It concludes with analyses of portraits of Princess Elizabeth by Robert Peake and of Sir Edward Herbert by Isaac Oliver amidst other graphic art that intimates “green-sickness beauty” and green melancholia.

Chapter three, “Between Black and White” critiques modern and post-modern theories, taking psychoanalytical theories by Freud, Jung, and Lacan as symptomatically color blind. The chapter’s climax features an Aristotelian spectrum of black to white and under their colors, thinking through bodies to thinking through brains. Notables range through philosophers Aristotle (black) to Plato (white) and include Bacon and Herbert (blue and green), Henry More and Descartes (violet), Hobbes (yellow), and Locke with Plato. Medical writers move from Burton (black) to Browne (red), scientists from Boyle (blue) to Newton (red), moral and ethical writers from Montaigne (green) through Wright (red) to Perkins (black), poets from Sidney (blue) through Shakespeare (green) to Jonson (red). Chapter four, “Green Spectacles” employs a pre-Cartesian psychology of perception and Horace’s *ut pictura poesis* as entries to examining relationships between seeing and wording in ephrastic poems. It looks at Sandys’ translation of Ovid’s account of creation and the King James Version of Genesis, with illustrative plates; Satan’s, readers’, and Adam’s views of paradise in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*; Spenser’s House of Busyrane in *The Faerie Queene*; Shakespeare’s representation of the destruction of Troy in *The Rape of Lucrece*; and Crashaw’s “The Flaming Heart.” It examines as well a painted mirror and paintings hung atop tapestries in Hardwick Hall, Derbyshire, tapestries of the four seasons and the judgment of Paris produced by Sheldon Workshops, and painted cloths in Owlpen Manor, Gloucestershire.

Chapter five, “Listening for Green” considers literary moments of hearing in color. It then examines changing notions of the marriage of words and music in psalmody from gregorian chant through Sternhold and Hopkins to Anglican chant by way of describing settings of the twenty-third psalm. Finally it seeks a full context for listening to the music of the world, humanity, and words as sounds and sensations from both early modern (Campion versus Daniel) and recent theories of poetic sound perception. All along it encourages listening for timbre, tone color.

Chapter six, “The Curtain between the Theatre and the Globe” examines ten plays the Lord Chamberlain’s Men performed in their interim playhouse before they moved the Theatre’s timbers across the Thames to Southwark. Stage directions, lines, and playbook illustra-

tions portray, imply, and refer to the use of curtains, arras, tapestries, painted cloths, traverses, hangings. Looking for sights corresponding to sounds he listened for in "Within the Wooden O," Smith expands insights gleaned from these early Shakespeare, Jonson, and others' plays as far as Restoration stagings. He aims to restore the brilliant and rousing spectacle of Renaissance drama that has been obscured due to our focus on language delivered on the bare darkened stages of the last half century. "Afterword: Coloring Books" sketches a suggestive history of *coloring* books, then recognizes a history of interactive readers coloring *books* so as to summarize and advocate historical phenomenology as means of understanding verbal and dramatic as well as visual art.

This anatomy of strong argument, myriad subjects, and stylish wit is inadequate to the extraordinary perception, learning, persuasion, and commitment that make Bruce Smith's work compelling. Anatomy, like the black and white binaries of logocentric analysis, lacks human sensory perceptions that lead to analogical, multiple-discoursed, multi-valenced, many-hued understanding. Characterization of Smith's interpretive mode may help. Periodically he critiques a pervasive logocentric, fixed and rational theory or application. This he counters with a sensation-seeking, transforming and passionate, personally engaged pre-cartesian colored understanding, buttressed by deconstruction, sensory materialism, and ecology. As such, he reveals the inadequacies of Hilliard's line and light *disegno* or Saussure's structural linguistics, preferring Derrida's and Wittgenstein's color and indeterminacy. And he faults the currently dominant "black box" presentation of English Renaissance drama, favoring a stagier, more complex and less determinate "green room" by displaying hangings and tapestries that drape beds and discovery places. Mainly Smith interlinks chains of material analyses to demonstrate how bodily and personal involvement account for more colorful, conflicted, ambiguous, human perceptions. Smith's predominant evidence comes from textiles and texts, two kinds of weavings. Textiles appear mainly in galleries and closets displaying marvels or encouraging contemplation. He looks particularly at sites, color and intensity and shade, spatial dimensions and arrangement, shape and repetition, narrative, and emblem, seeking emotional responses to compare and contrast

with contemporary and modern interpretations, physical and artistic. Texts often appear with illustrations. These he considers mainly in terms of narrative, imagery and emblem, etymologies and myths, rhetoric, and aurally of assonance, consonance, and dissonance, seeking emotional equivalents among interpretations by critics then and now. For both he scrutinizes critical annotations and analyses, taking umbrage at overhasty generalization, easy moralizing, and restrictive labeling, seeking instead physical sensations, contradictory shadings, and nuanced hues.

Bruce R. Smith's *The Key of Green* is an extraordinarily informative, insightful, and provocative work of scholarship. His proposal merits trial by every English renaissance literary scholar and consideration by literary critics of all persuasions, especially those of linguistic and rhetorical bent like myself, who might come to green our analyses. By no means will all agree with every proposal and interpretation. Smith can appear arbitrary and idiosyncratic, as in his placement of notables by thinking more and less dominantly through body or mind. He can overextend evidence, grasping at every potentially useful allusion to curtains on the stage. But some of his engagement with us comes from his pushing thesis and evidence as far as, perhaps sometimes further than, it can hold up. More engaging still are his passionately thoughtful interpretations of propositions, art, and evidence. *The Key of Green* is a moving, useful, pleasurable read.

John Kerrigan. *Archipelagic English: Literature, History and Politics 1603-1707*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. xiv + 599 pp. \$49.95.
Review by Eugene D. Hill, MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE.

As the title suggests, John Kerrigan's is an uncommon, and an uncommonly sophisticated, volume of history and literature. Such studies often suffer from an awkward choice between figure and ground: is the history the background for the literature, or the literature for the history? The concept of "archipelago" avoids this fraught choice, meaning as it does both a sea with many islands and a group of islands. The word also enables Kerrigan to avoid bruising tender ethnic sensibilities: as J.G.A. Pocock has remarked, "the term 'British

isles' is one which Irishmen reject and Englishmen decline to take quite seriously" (Pocock, *The Discovery of Islands* [2005], 29). Pocock pioneered treating "British history" as "multinational: a history of nations forming and deforming one another and themselves" (Pocock, 94). Kerrigan offers a series of case studies in seventeenth-century literature that exhibit this process of forming and deforming at work.

This approach works best with authors whose biographies exhibit attractively complex patterns of affiliation. Take one writer "who moved from the Gaelic Catholicism of rural Donegal, through the Ulster-Scots Presbyterianism of Derry, and higher education in Glasgow and Edinburgh, into freethinking pantheism" (89). This is John Toland, mentioned only in passing; but the intricate negotiation of national allegiances here is exemplary and furnishes the model for some of Kerrigan's best analysis, as in a strong chapter on Drummond of Hawthornden. Kerrigan expertly registers the "pragmatic" tacking between and among England and Scotland (and factions of each) and makes a good case that Drummond's intricate web of allegiances has led to his neglect in traditional literary history—and renders him particularly in tune with our own period.

Kerrigan's mode of interpretation does not always succeed with major figures. Herewith three comments on Shakespeare. *Coriolanus* "works with London perceptions of Anglo-Scottish difference in the polarity that it establishes between the fractious, politically complex world of Rome and the more archaic, aristocratic, and militaristic milieu of the Volscians" (18). Discussing Shakespeare's elimination of "the many years of good government which Macbeth brought to Scotland before he sank into tyranny," Kerrigan admits that the compression may serve dramatic purposes but argues that "one consequence of the change is that Scotland is never shown as a properly functioning state. It seems to be waiting for English intervention to stabilize it" (102). In Hamlet's Denmark too, we should be thinking of Scotland; of Fortinbras Kerrigan asserts that "[t]he analogy with a Scottish prince claiming rights of memory in England, and threatening to take the throne, if necessary by force, would have struck Shakespeare's audience" (16). Each of these contentions is extracted from a longer discussion, and different readers will perhaps have dif-

ferent estimates of their merit; but many will probably locate one or all toward the weaker end of a spectrum of plausibility.

Where, however, a life of chameleonic political activity combines with a rich literary output, Kerrigan comes into his own, as in a fine concluding chapter (before an Epilogue) on Defoe, whose multiple but never utterly opaque disguises as spy, agent, and provocateur furnish a model for his fiction: the “novels tend to be written from the point of view of protagonists who are vigilant because they have something to hide” (327). Readers who want to observe how splendidly Kerrigan works at the top of his form should open the book at its physical (and thematic) center: a reading of Marvell’s poem “The Loyal Scot” (274–80). A sample: “The deviousness of the poem is apparent in Marvell’s so positioning himself that he can ostensibly speak well of Lauderdale . . . in order to heighten tension between the king’s inner circle and the bishops”; the listing of bishops affords “a climax that stresses their responsibility for breaking up Protestantism. As Marvell punningly puts it: ‘What the Ocean binds, is by the Bishops rent,/ The[ir] Sees make Islands in our Continent.’ They turn Britain itself into an archipelago” (279).

Not everything in Kerrigan’s large book is at this level. One does have to make one’s way through longeurs, as with the Welsh scholar-poet Evan Evans (“But let not Cambrian science be forgot”; 396): “Ground down by his pastoral duties, frustrated by lack of security, and by the failure of patrons to support his work—to love, as he saw it, their country—he was overtaken by alcoholism and isolation. It would take a Fanon to do justice to the connections between Evans’s irascible fractiousness (notorious at the time) and his bilingual self-division” (397). But this, fortunately, is not typical either. *Archipelagic English* will enrich any scholar’s understanding of the seventeenth century. One shares Kerrigan’s fond hope that *Archipelagic English* (not least with its rich apparatus of primary and secondary sources) may serve to alleviate a problem the author identifies at the outset of his tome: “What is taught in certain North American universities as ‘British Literature’ turns out, especially for the period between Shakespeare and Defoe, to be ‘Eng. Lit.’ by another name” (8).

Matthew Birchwood. *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685*. Studies in Renaissance Literature 21. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 2007. viii + 200 pp. + 4 illus. \$95.00. Review by HUMBERTO GARCIA, VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY.

Prefixed to the 1649 English translation of *The Alcoran of Mahomet*, the translator's introduction stages the Turk as a historical actor who, along with English nonconformists, played a crucial role in the unfolding of seventeenth-century England's constitutional crisis following the regicide of King Charles I. The heresies and blasphemies of Islam present a danger only to the "Christian Reader" who, "too like Turks," "abandoned the Sun of the Gospel" in pursuit of the "strange lights" of "this Ignis Fatuus of the Alcoran" (qtd. in 65). While offering yet another condemnation of "Mahometanism," rehashing medieval Christian legends about the notorious "impostor" of Arabia, this translator alludes to the nonconformist parliamentary authorities who tried to suppress Alexander Ross's publication of this rival holy book during a turbulent period in which attacks on Islam could be polemically coded as an orthodox royalist assault on the fledgling English Republic. Matthew Birchwood's *Staging Islam in England: Drama and Culture, 1640-1685* foregrounds this forgotten episode in order to argue that cultural encounters with Islam served as a focal lens for reimagining England's national identity, on and off stage, during the age of Revolution and Restoration.

Although the book mainly looks at English plays of the period, as implied in the title, it also considers diplomatic letters, pamphlets, and other polemical genres. For Birchwood, staging Islam in this period implicates playwright, performers and audience "in a show of politicised other worlds that self-consciously and inevitably reflect back on their orchestrators" (14). The mirroring effect of mid seventeenth-century drama, which equally includes non-theatrical works, marks the site of ideological formation. Inherited from Reformation polemics about the dreaded Turk, coded as Catholic or Protestant depending on the writer's religious orientation, the persistent realignment of this Muslim figure with either republicans or royalists testifies to the widespread appeal of the Islamic metaphor, which Birchwood defines as "a set of complex and often contradictory ideas deployed by writ-

ers of every political complexion” (14). In other words, Islam is a flexible point of reference for coping with national anxieties between 1640 and 1685; a malleable literary device used for making sense of the Civil War, the regicide, Cromwell’s dictatorship, the restored Stuart monarchy, the problem of toleration, the succession, and the Exclusion Crisis. As such, *Staging Islam in England* narrates a story of cross-cultural negotiations between England and the Ottoman and Safavid Empires via the channels of trade, diplomacy, and religion. By reading the drama of this period in its specific historical context, this book has the virtue of presenting a compelling counter-narrative to Edward Said’s monolithic interpretation of the East, contributing to ongoing scholarly research about the figurative centrality of Islam in the English literature and culture of the early modern period.

In Chapters two and three, Birchwood examines how the controversial “Alcoran” lent itself to self-contradictory appropriations in Interregnum royalist plays that have received little scholarly attention. Having provided a lucid introduction to seventeenth-century England’s subordinate relationship with the theological, political, and military might of the Ottomans, Safavids, and Moroccans in the first chapter, the second chapter begins with an analysis of *The Famous Tragedie of Charles I*, an anonymous “pamphlet play” published shortly after the execution of Charles I in January 1649 and during the ban on theatre. By alluding to Cromwell’s framing of an “English Alchoran,” *The Famous Tragedie* evokes Ross’s publication in order to forge conflicting identifications between the tyrannical Turk and his counterparts, Charles I and Cromwell, ironically prefiguring the victory of the republican Commonwealth while also trying to contain the defeat of royalist politics after the regicide. Chapter three continues to explore these conflicting identifications in John Denham’s *The Sophy* (1642) and Robert Baron’s *Mirza* (1655), a play that employs the Qur’an as an ideological template for the political, religious, and moral act of translating holy texts, establishing an analogy between the Islamic menace without, and the Cromwellian menace within. Sadly enough, Birchwood never explains why Islam was “most commonly deemed to be republican,” other than referencing the royalist concerns of the translator’s preface and Ross’s “Caveat” to *The Alcoran* as self-explanatory evidence for this assertion (68).

Subsequent chapters examine the increasing politicization of “turning Turk” during the constitutional turmoil of the 1660s and 70s. Chapter four provides an analysis of the production and textual history of William Davenant’s *The Siege of Rhodes* (published in 1663 but performed as a musical recital circa 1656), an ideologically ambivalent two-part play that not only dramatizes the uneasy transition from Parliamentary rule to the restored monarchy but “also addresses the crisis of the playwright’s own apostasy” (105). Thus, the trope of Muslim conversion allegorizes, in complicated ways, the playwright’s (and the nation’s) turncoat status, from a subject of the old Stuart regime, a citizen of the Commonwealth, to a defender of the restored monarchy. Chapter five reads Davenant’s play and Roger Boyle’s *Mustapha* (1668) in the context of emerging enlightenment views of the Turk as formed in the diplomatic writings of Paul Rycaut and the heretical writings of Henry Stubbe, another apostate who switched affiliations from republican to loyalist. Accordingly, Stubbe’s *An Account of the Rise and Progress of Mahometanism*—an understudied pro-Islamic manuscript—is emblematic of the larger domestic conflicts that haunt Restoration drama: the problem of “liberty of conscious,” the legitimacy of universal (restored) monarchy, and the expansion of trade abroad. In Chapter six, these national anxieties, figured in the friend/enemy image of the Turk, take center stage in oriental-themed plays fixated on the Stuart succession, the Popish Plot, and the Exclusion Crisis, a series of constitutional problems that were exacerbated by in-coming news about the failed Turkish siege of Vienna in 1683.

Staging Islam in England is a well-written book that combines historically-informed close readings of key texts with original research. However, the prism of Anglo-Ottoman relations through which Birchwood reads mid-seventeenth-century drama is sometimes overbearing and, at worst, one-sided when considering the wider ramifications of Islamic geopolitical forces for English national politics. Fair to say, this book could not have been written without accounting for the prominence of Ottoman Turkey in this period, and yet Islamic modes of government were not confined to this region alone. Although Chapter Three discusses how Safavid Iran served as a competing model of Islamic (Shi’ite) virtue in Baron’s *Mirza*, other chapters say very little about the ways in which dramatic representations of Islam

were mediated by a global web of international and interregional relations that also included Ottoman-dominated Hungary, Muslim North Africa, and Mughal India. For example, Chapter six links the Popish Plot controversy to Hapsburg-Ottoman relations during the siege of Vienna, without mentioning that English debates about a Catholic succession were colored by the radical Protestant politics of Eastern Europe: namely, Protestant Hungary's rebellious defection to the Ottomans under the anti-Catholic, anti-Hapsburg leadership of Imre Thököly, who is frequently featured as Titus Oates's accomplice in anti-Whig polemics. Birchwood never considers this suggestive pairing in his discussion of the Titus-Turk trope. Moreover, he does not discuss the prominent figure of the "Moor" in Restoration plays such as Elkanah Settle's *The Empress of Morocco*, which is analyzed in Chapter six strictly in reference to the "Turk," and John Dryden's *Almanzor and Almahide, or The Conquest of Granada*, a two-part tragedy about the Christian conquest of Muslim Spain in 1492 that is not included in the book. Besides this play, Dryden's *Aurengzebe* could have broadened his analysis by looking at the problem of succession and toleration from the analogous perspective of seventeenth-century India's dynastic struggles.

But these limitations are overshadowed by Birchwood's monumental intervention. Undoubtedly, his pioneering scholarship will be of lasting importance for those who are interested in understanding the reception of Islam in mid and late seventeenth-century drama and culture, a timely topic that has been up to now poorly conceived and too often neglected. As he admits himself, *Staging Islam in England*, although limited in scope, offers a critical framework for studying other Islamic-themed works and canonical playwrights, such as Dryden, within the long-standing dramatic tradition of the "English Turk" as diligently outlined chapter-by-chapter. In the long run, this book revises Whig conceptions of progressive history that, in the wake of British imperialist historiography, have erased the formative role played by Islam in a series of constitutional debates that precipitated the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688.

Emily C. Bartels. *Speaking of the Moor: From Alcazar to Othello*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008. viii + 252 pp. \$55.00. Review by ANTHONY G. BARTHELEMY, UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI.

The dust jacket for Emily Bartels' book reveals much about the author's project. Superimposed upon a cropped 1644 map of Africa by Dutch cartographer Willem Janzoon Blaeu is a pair of men removed from the border of the map and placed in the center of the jacket. They are identified as "Moracchi." On either side of the "Moracchi" in the background are pairs of men identified as "Aegypti" and "Abissini." In the deep background, almost indistinguishable, stand a pair identified by the map illustrator as "Cafres in Mozambique." On the map they are clearly male and female, very dark, and the woman is topless. The pairs of men on the dust jacket get darker as they recede into the background, but only the "Cafres" are obscured. The jacket tells us that color has been added by its designer. I cannot speak to Bartels' artistic control over the cover, but nonetheless I think the jacket describes the place of Africa and Africans in this scholarly investigation of four English plays that focus on Moors on the English popular stage. For as the book looks at the plays' Moors, it claims that their representations "are not bounded by any set or single racial, religious or ethnic markers—by Africa or the New World, Islam or Turks, by blackness or tawnyness, or by an anxiety-provoking strangeness" (16). Instead, Bartels argues that Moors "unsettle" these "codifications" (16).

All four plays which Bartels examines are well known to scholars who have studied the representation of black characters on the English stage. Most scholars of early modern drama know Shakespeare's *Titus Andronicus* (1593-94) and *Othello* (1604). The other two plays are Peele's *The Battle of Alcazar* (1588-89) and Dekker's *Lust's Dominion* (1599-1600). Bartels discusses each play in a chapter of varying length; understandably she devotes more attention to the two texts by Shakespeare. *The Battle of Alcazar*, Bartels argues, is unique among the four because it does not take place in Europe. That fact lays the groundwork for the essential argument of the book: "*Alcazar* presses its spectators to look beyond the bounds of race, religion, and nation, to see a Mediterranean "world" improvised from the unpredictable

intersections of Europeans and non-Europeans, of Moors, Arabians, Turks, Portuguese, Spanish, Italians, and at least one Englishman” (43-44). This notion of a multicultural Mediterranean world drives the book’s analysis of these four plays.

With its decidedly international *dramatis personae*, *Alcazar* brings into contact and conflict a “world” of diverse people. Bartels suggests that the crisis of succession for the throne of *Alcazar* is important not just nationally but internationally, and this fact underscores the increasing significance of “evolving cross-cultural environment, contingent on political alliances and exchange” (30). This multiculturalism along with the promiscuous genealogy of the plays *Moroccans*, Bartels claims, minimizes the significance of blackness to the play. Moreover, she assures us that “the alienation of the Moor is not only not assumed; it is also not assured” (44).

The book continues its exploration of Mediterranean multiculturalism in the other three plays that notably take place in Europe, Italy for the Shakespearean dramas and Spain for *Lust’s Dominion*. In each of these plays, Bartels notes the integration of the Moors in the larger society around them. The titles of the chapters that treat the Shakespearean plays suggest how Bartels will develop this thesis. “Incorporate in Rome” studies how Aaron is integrated into Rome’s imperial household in *Titus Andronicus*, and “*Othello* and the Moor of Venice” explores the “of” in “Moor of Venice.”

Between each of the four chapters that critique the four plays, is a chapter devoted to an important cultural production that increased England’s knowledge of Africa. Thus we have chapters on Richard Hakluyt’s *Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques & Discoveries of the English Nation* (1589, 1598-1600), Queen Elizabeth’s orders to deport “divers blackmoores” from the kingdom (1596 and 1601), and John Pory’s translation of Leo Africanus’s *The History and Description of Africa* (1600). Each of these chapters furthers Bartels’ point that knowledge of Africa or interests there in was not of primary importance to the English. As she writes: “throughout the *Navigations*. . . Africa figures as a place of passage, a place to go *through*, literally and figuratively, rather than *to*” (52). Obviously, Bartels’ investigation is far more nuanced and complex than can possibly be summarized here, but she finds support for her conclusion that English interests in Africa were not

primarily shaped by a language of race and “discrimination.” This is especially true for the chapter on Queen Elizabeth’s orders to deport blacks out of the kingdom. Through minute and precise research Bartels recasts the famous documents not so much as an exercise in English and Elizabethan racism but as a very particular application of Elizabeth’s noted diplomacy and statecraft. I find this chapter the most rewarding chapter of the book, and I am sure scholars of early modern attitudes toward Africans and race will also find it so.

Overall I find Bartels’ focus on multiculturalism interesting, but at times she allows it to lead to somewhat anemic readings of the plays. Underplaying the English native dramatic tradition and the significance of blackness within its conventions weakens her arguments. Although Bartels acknowledges “established dichotomies of light and dark,” her book seems always to be minimizing those dichotomies rather than entangling them (149). While none of the four principal characters is a simple stereotype, all are referenced by their blackness which always signifies. In the conclusion of the chapter on *Othello*, Iago’s genealogy as a villain is traced back to Aaron of *Titus* who “is fashioned on a Jew (Barabas) who resembles a Turk (Ithamore) [both in Marlowe’s *The Jew of Malta*]” (190). Indeed this is a mighty line of villains, but if their ethnicity matters, so do the theatrical traditions that spawned them.

Catharine Gray. *Women Writers and Public Debate in 17th-Century Britain*. New York: Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. x + 262 pp. \$69.95. Review by MAURIZIO FARINA, UNIVERSITY OF PALERMO.

Apparently remote from the open-minded salon debates of the Enlightenment, the seventeenth century seems to confine the extra-parliamentarian discussion upon public issues to private meetings and elitist circulation of manuscript writings. Closed in the spaces of the household, the religious conventicle, and, in some cases, the literary coterie, the role of women found few occasions to clear its way in an epoch of proliferation of print. This book by Catharine Gray illustrates in what manner some women managed to “reproduce and disseminate” (59) their arguments for the reception of several audiences

between the Jacobean period and the Restoration. The “marginality to traditional institutions of church and state” of such personalities, as Gray explains, “made them crucial figures for imagining an expanded public culture beyond these very institutions—and beyond England” (2-3). Although the quantity of women writers remained “statistically marginal” (15) too, the gamut of the ideological stances represented by them appears to be wide, ranging from one extreme to another in England’s fragmented political world both before and after the outbreak of the Civil Wars, with important events or processes looming over the composition and the publication of every single work (such as the crises at Court, the shifting alliances between parties in Parliament, the movements of the New Model Army, and the vicissitudes of the teeming sects). Starting from Nancy Fraser’s criticism of Habermas’s conception of “private sphere” as peculiarity of the eighteenth-century rise of the bourgeois public opinion, Gray sets the activity of several female authors against the dominant political discourses of male hegemony—of Stuart monarchy first, of the Protectorate later. Nevertheless, though in several moments of crisis the works of these authors “also register the temporary loss of religious or royal patriarchal icons” (24), the book often demonstrates that “women’s authorship is not just social, rather than individual, in the early modern period: it is hetero-social. Women perforce write in collaboration, competition, and even cross-gender identification with men, creative counterpublics in which men and women form ideological alliances over political opposition and the revision or transgression of traditional gender norms” (31). Characterized by lively political and religious commitment, restricted groups centered on women became involved in the shaping of counterdiscourses, capable of extending their efficacy over the boundaries of their private environment to a public, often fully international, and even trans-continental context. In her inquiry, Gray—aware of the complex dynamics of this phenomenon—thus focuses on these all but isolated voices in a global background, which includes not only the British Isles but also public opinion overseas, in Europe, and in the American colonies.

The well-documented interaction between women authors and/or writers and male hearers, interlocutors, and supporters (if not self-defining simple mouthpieces, as is the case of Baptist reverend Henry

Jessey, who transcribed Sarah Wight's prophecies) challenges the abused dichotomy public/male—private/female: "One of the aims of this book, then, is to de-domesticate women's writing, resituating it in the public context it engages, without therefore divorcing it from the politicized private spheres in which it is nurtured" (13). Three out of the four chapters outline the religio-political activism of women belonging to the multi-faceted world of radical and independent currents (Diggers, Levellers, Baptists, Fifth Monarchists, Quakers, Unitarians, Antinomians, Anglo-Dutch Millenarians) who looked ahead to projects of pan-protestant struggle, showing us "women and (intermittently) feminized men as the shapers and bearers of an oppositional public culture that begins in private spheres of textual dialogue but imparts a complex transnational constellation of Catholic and Anglican publics and sectarian counterpublics" (191). Yet the presence of a Royalist woman writer amid this majority of dissenters shows that Gray has carefully taken into account the significant shift of the dominant public ideology in such a period of dramatic political upheavals, where counterpublics, though "always politically oppositional" (105), may or may not be necessarily located in the recusant field.

The women authors surveyed are Dorothy Leigh, Anglo-Calvinist author of a real best-seller, *The Zealous Mother*, a book of family advice published in 1616, here cogently interpreted as a voice of discreet and yet firm criticism to the patriarchal rhetoric of James I's *Basilicon Doron*, reissued that same year; Baptist Sarah Wight, whose fast and trance in April-July 1647, thoroughly recorded in the pages of Jessey's *The Exceeding Riches of Grace*, offers a significant instance of conversion narrative, where a shifting circle of visitors builds up the core of an oppositional force; the poet Katherine Philips, who by means of her more loosely scattered manuscript production affirms her role as a pivotal figure in a circle of nostalgic Royalists, basing her "oppositional public culture on the intimacy and exclusivity of coterie exchange" (107); and the no less nostalgic New England poet Anne Bradstreet, who, in her anti-Catholic and anti-Laudian writings of the period 1638-1650, conjures up Queen Elizabeth, Sir Philip Sidney and Du Bartas as mythical prototypes of fighters for the sake of true faith, in what Gray defines an "attempt to create a transatlantic version of

the neo-Elizabethan counterpublic” (155). One part of the conclusion of this book is in fact a shorter chapter in its own right, centered on the figures of Quaker women missionaries Katherine Evans and Sarah Cheevers, who in their *Short Relation* (1662) narrate their long journey and the reception of their preaching in distant lands, while at home their co-religionists were already facing the difficult phase of the Restoration.

The thick structuring of these five parts is somehow eased by parallel subdivisions. Each chapter begins with the contextualization of the composition in the wider frame of contemporary events, ranging from the crises of the 1610s to Charles II’s return, keeping an eye on the probable source-texts, before passing on to the analysis of several passages of the works, aiming at the definition of the peculiar relationship between the private sphere where the activity of these women writers began and the wider public sphere they were involved in. The attention then shifts to other texts of the same authors and lastly to coeval or later publications which seem to build up the textual legacy of the works studied, in order to confirm scope and strength of these notable seventeenth-century artifacts, which, beyond occasional gender vindications and apart from any re-definition of literary canons, remain enlightening testimonies “of an active and engaged citizenry who create[d] widespread debate” (19).

Kate Chedgzoy. *Women’s Writing in the British Atlantic World: Memory, Place and History, 1550-1700*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. viii + 267 pp. \$95.00. Review by LISSA BEAUCHAMP DESROCHES, ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY.

In *Women’s Writing in the British Atlantic World: Memory, Place and History, 1550-1700*, Kate Chedgzoy sets out to “mak[e] new connections between two important areas of Renaissance studies—the politics of space, place and nation; and memorial and historiographic practices—that, thriving separately, have not been adequately considered in relation to each other” (2). Chedgzoy is rhetorically sophisticated in that she identifies place and memory not only as key components of the methodology she employs but also of the works she considers.

In other words, rather than “British” or “American” or “colonial” or any of the other usual modifiers, the “British Atlantic World” comprehends both the significance of regional and historical boundaries as well as the common elements between regions and their histories; belonging is important to these women and to their writing, and the common and disparate attitudes regarding local and familial attachments are also crucial in Chedgzoy’s methodology.

Chedgzoy also spends considerable time recovering material from various manuscript sources, and performs some admirable excavations indeed. If there is any fault here, it might be that there is relatively little commonly known contextual material. Apart from Lady Anne Clifford, Anne Bradstreet, and Aphra Behn, many of these writers seem to belong to a somewhat recondite field, and she could have made more brief but significant connections to familiar contexts and sources by way of augmenting the relevance of her thesis. Still, Chedgzoy manages to “introduc[e] gender into the debate” (2) with some very trenchant readings of her chosen texts, readings that resist conventional feminist analysis while developing the feminist agenda of recovering women’s voices in interesting and new ways. Her contribution to the fields she interweaves—namely women’s writing, the politics of place, memory work, and various formal genres like autobiography, captivity narrative, commonplace books, dialogues, and elegies—is meaningful and worthy of considered attention, if only because she insists that women’s writing is such an archival process of interweaving traditions.

In Chapter one, “‘The rich Store-house of her memory’: The metaphors and practices of memory work,” Chedgzoy discusses Lady Anne Clifford’s various efforts to perform the Erasmian tenet that “teaching others is a particularly effective way of ensuring that one understands and remembers something” (18) in her household. Clifford, famously, dictated to her servants and instructed them on how to arrange notable quotations about her bedroom. “Active, interpretive listening” and the “art of hearing” (25) here instill a sense of literary sensibility that overrides literacy itself, however much Lady Clifford herself chose to record: “Reading aloud was an extremely common practice at almost all levels of society, and so reading . . . was often a collective, aural, performance activity, not merely a solitary, literate

one” (25-26). Chedgzoy then takes issue with the common feminist dismissal of Erasmus, Ramus, and Vives as authoritative figures interested in merely shaping women, as she points out that boys, too, were taught with many of the same methods, and that the figure of the waxen tablet for a woman’s mind can also denote a desirable adaptability and even agency. With reference to Vives, for instance, she comments that “The emphasis here on equipping the young woman with a repertoire of witty, smart and entertaining remarks complicates the doleful picture painted by [feminist analysis]” (32). Lady Clifford is a strong case in point, as she exemplifies “The practices of reading and writing associated with manuscript notebook compilations [that] construct the self not primarily as originator of an individual story, but as something formed in conversation, listening, reading and exchange” and which yet does not “deny the shaping power of that gathering, selecting, organizing subjectivity” (36). To this established context of Renaissance reading culture, Chedgzoy adds a less well-known subject in her analysis of *Katherine Thomas her Book*, a manuscript from the 1690s, which is an illustration of the “mother’s legacy” genre that is offered “as the textual representative of her maternal guidance” which “functions as both her surrogate in her children’s future lives, and her guarantee that they will remember her” (45). Altogether, this chapter is a wonderfully complex consideration of the nuances of the “reciprocal relation between listening, reading, speaking and writing” (19) in terms of how memory and texts co-operate to form monuments in the period.

Chapter two, “‘Writing things down has made you forget’: Memory, orality and cultural production,” takes as its topic the role of orality and its interactions with writing in memory practices in Ireland, Wales and Scotland. Since the bardic culture of these regions relies on performance rather than on publication, its key conventions are significantly familiar to women, who, as listeners and spectators, helped to perpetuate repertoires. Again, as with Lady Anne Clifford, “listening was not a passively receptive activity, but an engaged, attentive one that could and did lead to speaking, singing, and the generation of fresh contributions to repertoires of orally performed and transmitted verse and song” (57). Importantly, in such contexts, neither authorship nor publication signify privilege; the absence of manuscripts attributed to

women “does not bespeak lack of respect for women’s writing” (72; see also 65). Rather, the material in this chapter constitutes a strong reminder that performance of any kind introduces the sense of men *and* women as readers/interpreters, and that the material in question is profoundly collaborative: neither writing nor authorship matter here.

In Chapter three, entitled “Recollecting women from early modern Ireland, Scotland and Wales,” Chedzoy turns her focus back to textual matters, mining the archives of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales in separate sections both to indicate distinctions as well as to identify common themes. In Ireland, Caitlín Dubh’s poetry “blend[s] the formal public elegy for a male leader with the more feminine mode of the keen” (85) and Fionnghuala’s poetry recognizes how “keen-ing and other practices of public lamentation can be politicized and made to serve as a cultural ‘weapon of the weak’” (88, qtg James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* [New Haven: Yale UP, 1987]). Elizabeth Dowdall, “an Irish-born child of the colonial class” (90), and Alice Thornton, “an Englishwoman who spent formative childhood years in Ireland” (92), provide politically interesting accounts of the Irish rising that complicate notions of place and belonging. Scotland’s internal contrast of rural, orally-based traditions in the Highlands and sophisticated urbanity in the Lowlands supplies interesting variations on Ireland’s model, as there is continuity with Irish bardic practices (Màiri MacLeod and others) as well as self-reflexive parody of English literary models (Elizabeth Melville, Anna Hume). Finally, “The Welsh language . . . is already nothing more than a site of memory, the ‘remains’ of a once-great, now obsolete poetic tradition” (112) for Katherine Philips. But it is also a way of expressing self-perception, as Magdalen Lloyd’s letters to her family assert via her linguistic identity how she is “bound to [her service to various English families] by a range of ties of mutual obligation and care” (122) rather than by presumed subordination.

The topic of mourning takes a new turn with the focus of Chapter four, “‘Shedding teares for England’s loss’: Women’s writing and the memory of war.” Anne Bradstreet, Elizabeth Brackley and Jane Cavendish, Hester Pulter, and Lucy Hutchinson each provide complementary perspectives of the trauma of lost identity endured in wartime and “Articulated in domestic dramas, prose life-writings, and

formally diverse poetry” (125-126). While Bradstreet’s concerns are not significantly different from those of male political poets, she offers a distinctly feminine domestic context within which to establish her enduring monuments to those principles. For the Royalist sympathizers Brackley and Cavendish, the form of drama is itself a memorial practice during the civil war, shifting English national identity into exile (for men) and incarceration (for women), and Pulter’s elegiac poetry figures the female body as a lost memory palace. Post-war, the elegiac form takes on a more tragic sense for the Parliamentarian Hutchinson, who mourns the past in order to forge hope for the future. Interestingly, here, Chedgzoy notes that the “language of secondariness and insubstantialness articulates the melancholia of unresolved mourning at least as much as it expresses a simply gendered self-deprecation” (155). Ultimately, the Parliamentarian appropriation of the Royalist trope of tragedy (lost war vs. regicide) configures both sides as equally subject to loss, just as women and men lose each other through war.

Finally, in Chapter five, “Atlantic removes, memory’s travels,” Chedgzoy considers the significance of trauma in the captivity narratives of Mary Rowlandson’s *The Sovereignty and Goodness of God* and Aphra Behn’s *Oroonoko*. Both texts claim autobiographical authority, but in somewhat different ways: while Rowlandson narrates her own story, Behn claims to record Oroonoko’s and Imoinda’s story from various first-hand testimonies. Both texts “aspire to the status of histories, while grounding their claims to historical record in the interplay of personal and reported or collective memories” (169). Rowlandson is both witness to others’ suffering as well as an agonised subject of divine witnessing, and she uses a narrative structure to overcome the disjunctive effects of her traumatic experience of captivity. Behn claims to give voice to one who is otherwise silenced, and Chedgzoy observes the emergence of the Defoe-like claim to veracity via spontaneous sensibility over rational accuracy (189). But the multiplicity of testimonial voices here makes Behn more a mediator than an historian (190-191), which leads Chedgzoy to the interesting idea that the text seeks to reassemble, or re-member, the dismembered Oroonoko as a textual, written monument.

The significance of this book lies clearly in its thorough recovery of texts that range across the British Atlantic and yet which address

the similar themes and topics of loss, mourning, war, captivity, and perhaps most importantly, a keen sense of the importance of forging both personal and communal connections to place through language and over time. The notions of domestic space and the female body as cultural memory theatres, and the variations on forms that establish literary monuments, not only reflect but augment the canonical (and largely masculine-authored) work on memory in the period.

Anne Dunan-Page, ed. *The Religious Culture of the Huguenots 1660-1750*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2006. xvi + 218 pp. \$99.95. Review by RUTH WHELAN, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND MAYNOOTH.

The title of this collection of ten studies, which originates from a colloquium held in Montpellier in 2004 on the Huguenots in the British Isles and the American Colonies (1550-1789), does it an injustice, for its authors range broadly over a series of themes, some of which are only loosely connected to religious culture. The uncomfortable fit between Huguenots, who were Reformed Christians in the Calvinist tradition, and the Anglicanism of the receiving societies of England and Ireland—the latter being ruled by an Anglican minority—is the subject of two essays. The Huguenots who made it into the new *Oxford DNB*, particularly the Du Moulin family, is studied by Vivienne Larminie, who correctly notes that anti-popery created a common bond between French Reformed refugees (or nonconformists), French Episcopalians (or conformists), and English Anglicans. “Poor relief” captures the attention of Randolph Vigne, who outlines the institutions founded in Britain to address the need of the thousands of destitute French refugees who poured into London, particularly after the Glorious Revolution. The Huguenot military that swelled the ranks of William of Orange’s invading army and fought under Schomberg against their own compatriots, because of the alliance between James II and Louis XIV, also figure, alongside a summary of the life and sermonising of that contentious character in the New York Refuge, Louis Rou, pastor of the French Reformed Church of St. Esprit.

The most original essays in the volume, however, are devoted to the Huguenots as cultural intermediaries via their publications, which

were acquired by ecclesiastical libraries in Ireland; their journalism and ideas, with the Rainbow Coffee House in London playing a pivotal role; their contribution as tutors to John Locke's project for educational reform in Britain; and their intellectual influence, most notably that of Pierre Bayle on John Toland. These four case-studies add new information and insight to our existing picture of the way the movement of some 200,000 Huguenots out of France from the early 1680s onwards helped to prompt shifts in the political, cultural and intellectual map of late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Europe. Jane McKee's reconstruction of Huguenot publications figuring in libraries founded by the Church of Ireland in the eighteenth century in order to provide better intellectual support for the clergy, is an original and meticulously researched essay, which lays the foundations for future inquiry into the ways these books were read, that is, if they were read at all by Irish clergy. It is a pity, however, that the author did not compare the holdings of these smaller libraries with those of Archbishop Marsh's Library, Dublin, the first public library founded in the islands of Britain and Ireland, which does have a catalogue compiled in the early eighteenth century (contrary to what is stated here, 124) by its first librarian, the Huguenot refugee Élie Bouhéreau. S.J. Savonius's impressive study of Locke's critique of the essentially rhetorical education of the day, and the moral relativism he believed it fostered, highlights the way certain Huguenot tutors embodied for the philosopher an ideal of freedom, conceived as the ability to speak truth boldly to power. However, it does not answer the question as to why Locke thought that these men, who had themselves received a rhetorical education, would reject its values and endorse the "ethos of ingenuousness (*ingenuitas*) and fearless speech" (159), which he hoped they would instil in the sons of those who employed them. It might be more interesting to see Locke as an early myth-maker who projected onto Huguenots virtues that he wanted them to embody; as, indeed, does one of the authors in this volume, referring to the them as "one of Europe's most energetic, devout, industrious and brave peoples" (107). Simon Harvey and Elizabeth Grist provide a short but stimulating insight into the way the Rainbow Coffee House became an informal talking-shop, a public space where the Huguenot journalists Pierre Des Maizeaux and Michel de Laroche could engage

in intellectual exchange and garner the news and ideas that they then put into circulation through the periodicals, and in the case of Des Maizeaux, via his voluminous and, as yet, underexploited correspondence. Nonetheless, the authors' conclusion that the two journalists' "support for religious toleration helped to create the climate in which the radical thought of the Enlightenment could develop later in the eighteenth century" (172) is debatable in the light of recent studies. It raises the question as to the actual impact of ideas, and ignores the ways the quotidian resistance and political struggle for recognition and toleration—whether of Dissenters in Britain or Huguenots remaining in France—acted as catalysts of change.¹ Myriam Yardeni's consideration of Huguenot traces and reminiscences in John Toland's conception of tolerance reveals how much ideas could shift in their transmission from one thinker to another. Toland argued in favour of freedom of conscience while supporting the imposition of civil impediments on dissent, which makes him more conservative than Pierre Bayle, on whose defence of toleration he draws. Another example, if one were needed, that ideas in and of themselves are not necessarily agents of change.

There are, however, a number of misconceptions running through this book. Some authors confuse the members of the French Reformed Churches with Presbyterians (38, 43, 45), which is inaccurate; or refer to them as "dissenting churches" (50, 51, 52, 53), which is misleading, since their existence in Ireland was sanctioned by the 1692 act of parliament; or use the term "Huguenot faith" (53), which is meaningless. Although the Presbyterian and French Reformed traditions were both Calvinist in origin, their confessions, ecclesiology and liturgical practices developed differently; understanding those differences is important to any history of the way the religious culture of the Huguenots evolved in the Refuge.² There was, to the best of my knowledge, no statute passed by the Parliament in Dublin "stipulating that only French ministers willing to conform to Anglican rites

1 On this, see S. J. Barnett, *The Enlightenment and Religion: The Myth of Modernity* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003).

2 On this see Ruth Whelan, "Sanctified by the Word: the Huguenots and Anglican Liturgy," in Kevin Herlihy, ed, *Propagating the Word of Irish Dissent* (Dublin: Four Courts, 1998):74-94.

would be guaranteed livings within the state Church” (44, 47), and the author cites no source that could substantiate this claim. Nor was there an “Act of 1704” (50), which proved divisive to the refugees in Ireland. There is, moreover, little evidence that “in 1665 most of the French refugees arriving in Ireland officially conformed to Anglicanism,” and none given by the author (49). It is not true that the French Episcopalians (or conformists), who worshipped in the Lady Chapel of St Patrick’s Cathedral followed a “Calvinist discipline”; in the 1660s they were governed wholly by the canons of the Church of Ireland; in the 1690s a compromise between the two was reached under the astute guidance of Archbishop Marsh. There was no such thing as an “officially conformist *party*” (my emphasis) in Ireland (50); conforming to the Church of Ireland was more than “an act of civil obedience to the Crown” (51) for those who elected to do so, it was also—and possibly primarily—a matter of conscience, since they believed that the Church of Ireland was a truly reformed church. It is not clear to me how Frederick Herman von Schomberg, by birth German and by naturalization French, could be presented as “this chief representative of French Protestantism” (90). It is mystifying to find the Huguenot *pastor*, Jacques Fontaine, adduced as an example of the religious worldview of the Huguenot *soldiery*, pensioned off on the Irish establishment, given that Fontaine neither participated in the Williamite reduction of Ireland (as stated here, 99) nor settled among the retired military in Portarlington (as alleged here, 97). It is simply not true to say that “it is usually argued that militancy of any sort was alien to the Huguenots as a group,” (98) since the contrary is amply demonstrated by their armed resistance as late as the 1620s, their participation in the Williamite wars from 1688, and the Camisard revolt in the Cévennes in the early eighteenth century. The *Églises Réformées de France*—the plural (not the singular, as on 132) is important since it was a federation of churches—were governed by a consistory composed of the pastor or pastors, who acted as moderators, and lay elders who were nominated by the consistory, but not by magistrates or a “magistracy” (100, 101, 102). The term “High Church Huguenots” is mystifying (103, 104), as is the notion that there was racial hostility in “Portarlington, Dublin and London” (106); there is some evidence of xenophobia towards the French

refugees in Dublin and London, but they were after all European and Protestant, Caucasians all, displaying no *racial* differences from the native populations of the islands of Britain and Ireland.

Inter-disciplinary scholarship provides particular challenges to editors, who cannot be expected to have mastered every field of inquiry represented in the volumes they publish. Nonetheless, academic publishers such as Ashgate might be reminded to engage more assertive scholarly referees, who could spot such misconceptions before a book goes to print. Mistakes apart, however, this volume makes a valuable, mostly interesting, and at times original contribution to our understanding of the Huguenots in exile.

Steven Matthews. *Theology and Science in the Thought of Francis Bacon*. Aldershot, Hampshire; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008. ix + 150 pp. £50.00. Review by MARK G. SPENCER, BROCK UNIVERSITY.

“What is the reason for yet another book on Francis Bacon?” (vii) asks Steven Matthews at the outset of his. Matthews’s answer to that question picks up on Stephen McKnight’s recent observation made in *The Religious Foundations of Francis Bacon’s Thought* (Columbia, 2006) that “there is still no book-length analysis of Bacon’s use of religious images and themes in his major works, and there is no systematic development of Bacon’s religious outlook” (quoted at viii in the book under review, which is dedicated to McKnight). While Bacon’s religious beliefs have been the subject of much historical debate over the years, Matthews aims, quite reasonably, to “place Bacon back in his proper day and age, and let his own writings inform us about where he fitted in the theological landscape of Tudor and Stuart England” (vii). The book he has written not only adds much to our knowledge of Bacon’s thought but raises stimulating questions about the links between this seventeenth-century figure and the eighteenth-century Enlightenment.

The project begins with a chapter on the religious context of Bacon’s time and place. Here, Matthews argues persuasively for the complexity of the religious landscape in late sixteenth and seventeenth-century England. In short, textbook understandings

of a “continuum” with Catholics at one end and Protestants at the other will not do. The mixing of theological and political motives in Tudor and Stuart England, Matthews suggests (in an argument that will strike some readers as reminiscent of David Hume’s account of religious factions in his *History of England*) was such that Bacon and other intellectuals living in England at this time “had before them a smorgasbord of ideas and theological influences that would mix and blend as they were taken up or ignored, assimilated or rejected” (11). Main dishes on offer included the writings of the Church Fathers and also the Hebrew Scriptures, all of which were seen through the general “belief in a glorious providential age” (20). Matthews reads Bacon’s *An Advertisement Touching the Controversies of the Church of England* (1589) as evidence for the fact that Bacon was engaged from early on with much of the context he paints and as one of the steps by which Bacon moved away from the Calvinism of his mother and towards a revised version of the theology of the Eastern Church Fathers.

Narrowing the context, Matthews gives particular attention to Saint Irenaeus of Lyon whose “ultimate goal” of “the mystical union of God and man” (46) Bacon found compelling. Matthews also draws parallels between Bacon and his good friend Lancelot of Andrewes. Andrewes “lived and valued a life of pious and chaste seclusion” (40), and his general commitment to late antiquity Christianity Matthews finds mirrored in Bacon’s writings, including Bacon’s *Confession of Faith*, a text that should not be read (as some have read it) as Bacon’s being ironic. For Matthews, “there is a recognizable trajectory in Bacon’s adult life away from his Puritan upbringing, and ultimately away from the dominant Calvinism of his society as well” (2). Matthews differentiates sharply between Bacon and Calvin on the topics of the pursuit of earthly knowledge and human nature. “For Calvin and his adherents, human knowledge still existed after the fall, but it was corrupt and always untrustworthy. For, as part of the punishment of sin, ‘soundness of mind and uprightness of heart were withdrawn at the same time’” (70).

One of the most important contributions of this study is the way in which it complicates the relation between Bacon and the Enlightenment. Indeed, that rich line of inquiry could have been more effectively incorporated into the earlier chapters of the volume

rather than being developed and emphasized towards the end. Doing so would add more weight to the layered conclusions drawn along the way. In a similar manner the potted biographical summaries of those within Bacon's circle which are the focus of the volume's final chapter—men such as Tobie Matthew, William Rawley, John Selden, George Herbert, Thomas Hobbes, and Thomas Bodley—might have been integrated into the book's overall argument.

Bacon's *Instauratio Magna*, or "Great Instauration," which scholars have tended to read as an important opening chapter of the Enlightenment project, Matthews presents as part of Bacon's perception of a sacred narrative. Yes, Bacon argued for the benefits of the "pursuit of earthly knowledge." As he put it in *The Advancement of Knowledge*:

And as for the conceit that too much knowledge should incline a man to atheism, and that ignorance of second causes should make a more devout dependence upon God which is the first cause; first, it is good to ask the question which Job asked of his friends, *Will you lie for God, as one man will do for another, to gratify him?* For certain it is that God worketh nothing in nature but by second causes; and if they would have it otherwise believed, it is mere imposture, as it were in favour towards God; and nothing else but to offer the author of truth the unclean sacrifice of a lie. (56)

But Bacon saw the quest for earthly knowledge as part of a divine pattern. And so Bacon saw his own times as being far superior to antiquity in that his age was—to quote from Daniel 12:4 as Bacon himself did—the prophesized age in which "many shall go to and fro and knowledge shall be increased" (83). Bacon considered the "opening the world by navigation" and the securing of "civil peace and prosperity" (92) as essential underpinning for his Instauration, even if he later came to doubt that the time was right in the England of his day.

In Bacon's thought, Matthews argues, theology and science are not opposed. For example, for Bacon "naming" things was "always the identification of the thing according to its true function and use" (61) as assigned by God. In a line which rings true for many eighteenth-century thinkers too, Bacon wrote,

It is an assured truth and a conclusion of experience, that a little or superficial knowledge of philosophy may incline the mind of man to atheism, but a farther proceeding therein doth bring the mind back again to religion; for in the entrance of philosophy, when the second causes, which are next unto the senses, do offer themselves to the mind of man, if it dwell and stay there, it may induce some oblivion of the highest cause; but when a man masseth on farther, and seeth the dependence of causes and the works of Providence; then, according to the allegory of the poets, he will easily believe that the highest link of nature's chain must needs be tied to the foot of Jupiter's chair. (68-69)

While Matthews argues that his historical Bacon is one who ought to be more clearly differentiated from “the image of the Enlightenment deist or atheist,” it might also be possible to argue that parts of the historical Enlightenment are closer to Matthews's Bacon than he here acknowledges. If that is so, it adds further weight to explaining the interesting paradox “that many in the next generation of Baconians were Calvinists” (133). Matthews hints that “how Bacon's theology became acceptable to Calvinists is a question which may take another book or two to answer properly” (134). Let's hope he decides to turn to that question as the results are sure to be as thought-provoking as the fine volume under review here.

David Booy. *The Notebooks of Nehemiah Wallington, 1618-1654. A Selection*. Aldershot, England and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2007. xxii + 372 pp. \$99.95. Review by WAYNE SPARKMAN, PCA HISTORICAL CENTER.

Ah sirs, let me tell you, there is not such a pleasant history for you to read in all the world, as the history of your own lives, if you would but sit down and record to yourselves from the beginning hitherto, what God hath been to you, and done for you: what signal manifestations and out-breakings of his mercy, faithfulness, and love, there have been in all the conditions you have passed through: If your

hearts do not melt before you have gone half through that history, they are hard hearts indeed.”

—John Flavel, *The Mystery of Providence* (1677)

Though they were not contemporaries, I can think of no greater example of a life lived according to Flavel’s advice than that of Nehemiah Wallington (1598-1658). The study of God’s providence in the life of the Christian proves to have been a constant Puritan fascination, and the journals of an otherwise obscure seventeenth-century London woodturner by the name of Nehemiah Wallington serve to prove the point. Composing an astounding fifty volumes in record of his spiritual journey between the years 1618-1654, Wallington compulsively wrote about his Christian journey, and in doing so provided a treasure-trove of details about seventeenth-century London, English politics and religion, and the life of the common worker in that era.

Paul Seaver’s earlier treatment, *Wallington’s World: A Puritan Artisan in Seventeenth-Century London* (1985), garnered a good bit of interest, but only gave us bits of the documents themselves. Readers who remember that work will definitely want access to this new title. Moreover, since Seaver wrote, another Wallington manuscript has been discovered (Tatton Park ms #68.20), adding approximately 600 pages to the source total. Four institutions preserve these seven manuscripts, and these are noted below in the chapter headings provided.

Though regrettably only seven of Wallington’s journals are extant, Dr. David Booy has performed an admirable service in making available to the reader a careful set of excerpts from each of the seven notebooks. His intent in the selection process is to provide “a judicious selection of material from all the extant notebooks that demonstrates their full range and character” [ix]. One refinement in Booy’s method should be noted, for he has taken pains to provide substantive, lengthy sections from the journals, rather than mere quotes and briefs. That preservation of context is one bit of insurance toward the abiding value of this work.

The book is laid out in a careful, logical format. Following the standard preface and acknowledgments, a seven-page section on editorial procedure provides a useful orientation and serves to answer some potential questions. Spelling and other grammatical conventions

are covered, as well as the use of upper and lower case letters, textual insertions and deletions, and other conventions. There is also a succinct guide to Wallington's manner of dating and a terse summary on the currency of that era.

Two pages of Glossary follow the Editorial Procedure, with the intent to provide glosses and spelling variations that might otherwise confuse the modern reader. Commendable as this is, the audience in view would seem to be more that of the average lay reader, whereas most readers of *The Seventeenth-Century News* should have few problems here. Of the sixteen words covered, few really needed explanation if one has done much reading in the literature of this period. The background provided under the term *traine*, *trayne* or *trained bands*, i.e., local militia, was a helpful historical refresher. On the other hand, the explanation of *conversation* as "social behaviour" was a much more rudimentary note.

A chapter of introduction then precedes the accounts themselves. Here Dr. Booy first provides some thoughts on the general usefulness of these journals as primary sources, then a brief biographical sketch of Nehemiah Wallington, which delves at times into the character of the man, but which also treats of the larger context of Wallington's life, the city where he lived and the politics of his day. In a work where so much of the editor's efforts are hidden from the reader (the process of compilation and condensation), it is only in the final twenty pages of the Introduction where Booy finally affords himself a substantive space for his own thoughts on the importance of Wallington's "life-writings" and spends some space developing the twin concepts of self and individual voice.

In the seven chapters that follow, each prefaced with a brief introduction, one chapter is allotted to each of the extant manuscripts. Those seven manuscripts total some 3200 pages in length. Winnowing that material, Dr. Booy in turn presents the reader with about 314 pages of text, or nearly one-tenth of the total extant material. Space does not permit comment on Wallington's narrative itself, but to provide an overview, the seven chapters, their manuscript sources, and the length of each excerpt provided, are as follows:

- A Record of Gods Marcys, or a Thankfull Remembrance (Guildhall Library, London, Manuscript 204), 68 pages of text.
- A Memoriall of Gods Judgments upon Sabbath breakers, Drunkerds and other vile livers (British Library, Sloane Manuscript 1457), 18 pages.
- A Bundel of Marcys (British Library, Additional Manuscript 21 935), 31 pages.
- The groth of a Christian (British Library, Additional Manuscript 40 883), 68 pages.
- A Record of marcys continued or yet God is good to Israel (Tatton Park Manuscript 68.20), 20 pages.
- Profitable and comfortabl letters (British Library, Sloane Manuscript 922), 28 pages.
- An Extract of the passages of my life or the Booke of all my writting books (Folger Shakespeare Library Manuscript V.a.436), 81 pages.

The book ends with a very useful section of references and indexes that follows the final chapter, and for this additional effort the editor should be commended. References are divided into those materials published before 1850 and those published after. Of the former, there is citation of three manuscripts from the Guildhall Library, London, a score of newsbooks largely from the period of the interregnum, and sixty works both religious and secular. Just under one hundred works published after 1850 are referenced in a second section, though most of these are publications from the last thirty years. A final reference category addresses fourteen principal sources not directly cited in the footnotes. Three indexes conclude the book. In addition to a general index that is twelve pages in length, the reader also benefits from an index to books of the Bible and an index of biblical figures and places, each about one and one-half pages in length.

In short, this is a remarkably useful book about a very remarkable man who lived in some of the most interesting of times. Since the founding of the Evangelical Library, there has been a revival of interest in Puritan literature, but resources for the study of the woman or man in the pew have been insufficient by comparison.

Now with the availability of this book (all expense aside), there can hopefully be further consideration of the workers, the common people and the faithful congregants of that era. For those who might want a closer look at the text before purchasing, a liberal portion of the book can presently be accessed on the Internet through Google Books. This might also be a good occasion to revisit Seaver's work, and there again, the same source provides an ample preview. Dr. Booy has done great service in making these journals available to the modern reader, and the work should be well-received. Some readers may also want to attend to his other writings, which generally focus on autobiographical literature from the seventeenth century. His two earlier volumes are respectively, *Personal Disclosures: An Anthology of Self-Writings from the Seventeenth Century* (2002) and *Autobiographical Writings by Early Quaker Women* (2004).

One curious note in closing: citation of this book does occasionally appear under the title *The Selected Writings of Nehemiah Wallington: The Thoughts and Considerations of a London Puritan and Wood-Turner, 1618-1654* (2007). Nothing appears under that title on OCLC's WorldCat, nor is there anything in the copy at hand that would sustain that title. So it remains unclear to this reviewer whether that is, or was, the title of an English edition or a prior printing or perhaps simply an error that has been picked up and repeated.

J. S. Maloy. *The Colonial American Origins of Modern Democratic Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. ix + 214 pp. \$75.00. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

In *The Colonial American Origins of Modern Democratic Thought* J. S. Maloy investigates the principle of governmental accountability—that is, the means or instruments whereby the public can hold elected politicians accountable for their behavior while fulfilling their term in office. Presently in the United States, once officials are elected to governmental posts they remain largely exempt from citizen correction until the end of their term. Even then, politicians can be held accountable only if they rerun for the same office. Until that electoral occasion, voters are alienated from their rightful democratic agency

and, for the most part, remain powerless to control their rulers serving their appointed terms.

Accountability was not always restricted in this manner, Maloy discloses, nor did this peculiar version of accountability in democratic theory suddenly emerge in post-Revolutionary America. It actually originated much earlier, with the seventeenth century having been a time when democratic theory was an especially yeasty brew of contesting ideas. During that century, Maloy finds, there were various, if marginalized, mechanisms for responding to a politician's performance while in office. These instruments, generally exercised by a concerned social elite, were derived from inquest models associated with the classical regard for public liberty, the ecclesiastical oversight of religious truth and the fiduciary protection of investor interests.

Maloy points to the Levellers, that loosely allied anti-Parliament resistance group particularly noteworthy today for its "democratic" political views expressed during the English Civil War. Abrading against the grain of more traditional assumptions about authority, the Levellers advanced the notion of constituent power. John Lilburne, a "Leveller so-called" in his own words, had argued during the 1640s that humans possessed certain rights that could not be abridged by governmental agents. This was so, Lilburne believed, because the authority to rule derived fundamentally from the will of the people.

Today democratic societies tend to perceive Lilburne's claim to be a commonplace idea. But scrutinized more closely, Maloy contends, the Levellers understood popular elections as neither the only nor even the best means to deter tyranny or misrule. Their conception of governmental accountability included a radical feature of democratic theory that we somehow have not embraced today.

Leveller democratic theory insisted on rulers being *regularly* accountable to the people. It emphasized non-electoral means of accountability at the local level, including special inquests, frequent audits, issue-related impeachments and assessments of legal liability. Collectively, such devices were designed to expose governing officials who betrayed the public trust.

For the Levellers, then, a productive tension existed between traditional and non-traditional means of ruler accountability. Even decades before the English Civil War, Maloy argues, this tension can be

found in commentary by colonial American settlers. This is the case, we learn, with John Smith's "discourse of virtue and corruption" (58).

Without toppling the traditional regard for authority and without dismissing governmental directives from the homeland, Smith maintained that the New World was a "proving-ground for virtuous men" (63) whose competence and honesty qualified them to be entrusted with wide discretionary powers. These locally approved and locally evaluated men of exemplary character and leadership would, Smith thought, counter exploitative colonial factions. A combination of democratic and aristocratic paradigms, augmented by an image of Virginia as a little commonwealth in its own right, informs Smith's elevated estimation of such representative men.

The Pilgrims in Plymouth and the Puritans in Massachusetts Bay were also sensitive to and critical of the impact of profiteering in Virginia. But, Maloy observes, this was not the only concern they shared with Smith. They also shared his valorization of virtuous local leadership.

Even so, they stressed their difference from the Virginian colonists. Believing they were communally joined in a sacred and intimate bond, Pilgrims and Puritans alike represented themselves as more virtuous, more industrious and more economical than Virginians. "This was," Maloy explains, "a purely internal kind of fidelity, not a trans-oceanic one between colonial servants and their metropolitan masters—thus foreshadowing the New Englanders' use of ideas of not only personal but also political trust" (93).

Elements of democratic theory also trace back to how Separatists and Congregationalists hedged their management of the structure of ecclesiastical authority. In ecclesiastical matters, both groups acknowledged a hierarchical distribution of authority while at the same time they accorded some power to the laity. Balancing these two ideas was hardly simple, and sometimes the balance was easily lost, such as during the Antinomian controversy. During this crisis, for instance, church and government authority figures were quick to discredit ecclesiastical populism as too prone to heresy.

However, John Cotton, Increase Mather and others continued the mixture of political modes. They upheld aristocratic ministerial authority but also allowed for popular consent, such as ratification

and selection, albeit without quite the power of democratic accountability. John Winthrop, too, insisted on political trust in magisterial discretion, and (like Smith) he pointed to the virtue of his personal achievements in support of his emphasis on trust in political leadership; yet Winthrop also accommodated electoral accountability.

In all of these and other colonial instances reviewed in Maloy's study, the tilt was always towards authority or governmental agents' discretionary power. And this tilt had a lasting impact as democratic theory in the colonies drifted toward the reliance on regular elections as a sufficient mechanism for ruler accountability.

What got lost was a Leveller-like inclusion of broader non-electoral controls. What got lost was a more personal and more pervasive citizen input involving an actual and routine exercise of elector power. What displaced and obscured this elector or constituent power, Maloy claims, was a mystifying idealized language of democracy that effectively enabled (and still enables today) the traditional understanding of a ruler's discretionary power.

The Colonial American Origins of Modern Democratic Thought is a hard read. Its overly compacted sentences feature insider vocabulary, abrupt transitions, contracted or elliptical observations and non-linear argumentation. Whenever these features impair a reader's close-up scrutiny of the means and progression of discussion, the author's discretionary authority is enabled—a discursive performance that sometimes seems ironically to mimic the very idealized and co-optating political language critiqued in the book.

My grouching about manner aside, though, Maloy offers a thoughtful reevaluation of the importance of both the Levellers and the French political philosopher Jean Bodin to the emergence of modern democratic theory. And Maloy's detailed reconsideration of the financial, governmental and ecclesiastical structures of the early colonial period successfully sheds new light on the rise of an electoral procedure that eventually formalized a considerable reduction of the American public's potential democratic agency.

R. Tudur Jones, Arthur Long, and Rosemary Moore, eds. *Protestant Nonconformist Texts, Volume 1: 1550 to 1700*. Aldershot: Ashgate Press, 2007. xiii + 421 pp. \$145.00. Review by STEVEN PAUL MATTHEWS, THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, DULUTH.

According to the series editor, Alan P. F. Sell, this volume “is intended as an appetizer, and a stimulus to further quarrying” in the literature of Protestant Nonconformity (ix). This modest statement of intent is met and exceeded by the volume of primary sources which it introduces. Implicated in everything from the Civil War to the origins of the Royal Society, no phenomenon looms larger in the history of seventeenth-century England than the development of Nonconformist and separatist religious groups, and this book is an excellent introduction to the topic.

“Protestant Nonconformity” in this volume is broadly defined to include all Protestant sects which found themselves outside the established Church of England in the era, whether merely objecting to the canons of uniformity in a given period, or genuinely separatist. This allows for the full range of dissent from the official church to be introduced in a single volume: from mainline Puritans, through Fifth Monarchists, through the Quakers. There is real value in this approach as it presents the tapestry of dissenting ideas and convictions in its genuine historical complexity, whereas in volumes focusing on “Puritan” or “Quaker” writings this sense that the authors are part of a larger picture is lost to the convenience of tidy categories. The editors recognize that “during the turbulent years between 1640 and 1650 virtually every group of Christians was at one time or another “Nonconformist” including Roman Catholics and Anglicans (9). The former had technically not “conformed” since the accession of Elizabeth, and the latter were technically Nonconformist through the Interregnum. These groups are not included within the volume since they have clear and official definitions through most of the period, and are not really the “dissenters” with which the volume is concerned (10). The reasoning should be clear to all who study religion in this era, but this attention to detail in defining the subject is laudable, and representative of the editors’ concern for historical accuracy throughout the book.

Another strength of the volume is its choice of categories which have been suggested by the content of the primary sources themselves. In this way the entire volume reflects the concerns of the Nonconformists themselves rather than the potentially anachronistic interests of later scholars. The book is divided into eight sections. The first four sections are chronologically arranged through the Glorious Revolution: “Part I: The Beginnings, 1550—1603”; “Part II: Perseverance, 1604—1642”; “Part III: Facets of Freedom, 1640—1660”; and “Part IV: Persecution, 1660—1689.” The section titles clearly reflect the concerns of the Nonconformists, and their interpretation of events, at the time. The editors have included in these sections official decrees such as Archbishop Parker’s *Advertisements* dealing with vestments and the 1672 *Declaration of Indulgence* in order to provide context for the documents of the dissenters themselves. These four sections walk the reader through the history of Nonconformity in the words of those involved, and are followed by three more which flesh-out the interests and concerns of the various movements: “Part V: Aspects of Nonconformist Experience” presents the interests in personal conversion and the subjective experience of the faith which dominated Nonconformist concerns; “Part VI: A Theological Miscellany” pans the range of theological concerns which were behind the various movements; and “Part VII: Poetry” includes a few hymns as well as selections from Milton. “Part VIII: The Dawn of Toleration” rounds out the book with the historical developments following the Glorious Revolution. In all sections the editors have shown a concern for the genuine diversity of the phenomenon of Nonconformity. Significant figures such as Milton (who is featured prominently throughout) appear not as isolated voices, but in their proper context as part of the spectrum of dissent which provided the motivation for so many events and policies in early modern England.

The historical introduction to the volume is concise, yet an impressively thorough overview of the narrative of English history related to Nonconformity. The individual introductions to the documents are also very well done, providing appropriate information necessary to establish each text within the context established by the volume introduction. The editorial care taken with this book extends to the selection of texts themselves. From a vast field of potential sources

the editors chose those which represent not only the theological concerns of the different movements, but the personal passion and very human concerns of the individuals as well. Selections from Philip Henry's Diary (243-48) and the farewell sermons of ejected clergy (235-43) add considerably to what, in textbooks, is too often a lifeless social and political narrative; and the selections in Part V, relating to personal experience, give the reader a window into the interests and values which motivated the Nonconformists to risk everything for their convictions.

This volume serves its intended function, as a firsthand introduction to early Protestant Nonconformity, extremely well. The history of religious thought in Tudor and Stuart England is too often dominated by caricatures and generalizations of the groups involved, which only primary sources can dispel. This volume would work well as a seminar reading for graduate students, and it is a must-read for those who wish to address any issues of seventeenth-century English religion in a dissertation or monograph. It is an excellent starting point for all further research in the area. Although Ashgate always produces high quality books, the downside is a price tag which is prohibitive except for libraries. A graduate seminar would have to juggle a single text, when it would make an excellent required text for students of history and literature alike.

Rosemary O'Day, ed. *Cassandra Brydges, Duchess of Chandos, 1670-1735: Life and Letters*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, U.K.: Boydell Press, 2007. viii + 442 + 14 illus. \$145.00. Review by ELLEN J. JENKINS, ARKANSAS TECH UNIVERSITY.

The surviving letters of Cassandra Brydges, first Duchess of Chandos, demonstrate the narrowness of those historical interpretations of the past thirty years that limited seventeenth- and eighteenth-century women of the upper classes to little more than reproductive and decorative roles. Rosemary O'Day has provided an annotated edition of the letters of Cassandra (Willoughby) Brydges, demonstrating that the duchess, who did not marry until she was forty-three, was a talented diplomat, investor, matchmaker, and wielder of influ-

ence on behalf of the large and tangled network of relations and acquaintances in her sphere. O'Day, who teaches history at the Open University and is a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, has gone to great lengths to identify recipients of these letters and unknot the duchess's relationships, providing a dexterous and expert commentary on this noteworthy woman, her correspondence, and her service to family and friends.

In 1713, Cassandra Willoughby became the second wife of her cousin, James Brydges (1674-1744), who had been a Member of Parliament for Hereford (1698-1714), Paymaster General for the British forces overseas during the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714), and subsequently was created Earl of Carnarvon. In 1719, he was created first Duke of Chandos. O'Day points out that one of the reasons Cassandra Willoughby married James Brydges was to further the fortunes and influence of her brothers, their families, and the rest of the Willoughbys, a responsibility she took on with dedication. Hers appears to have been a successful companionate marriage; in a number of the letters included in O'Day's book, the duchess is obviously writing to accomplish the duke's bidding and smooth a difficult situation—either delivering a warning to an unruly nephew or refusing a request for help from someone seeking preferment or support. O'Day explains that by sending such messages at one remove, the duke was able to make use of his wife as “gatekeeper” to his patronage (13).

Both before and during their marriage, Cassandra and James Brydges were involved in the emerging stock market of the early eighteenth century. They advised friends, acquaintances, and family members on stocks, investing for themselves, administering and brokering investments for relatives, and holding stock in a variety of enterprises, including the infamous South Sea Company, chartered in 1711 to help pay off Britain's debts incurred during the War of the Spanish Succession. When the South Sea “Bubble” burst in 1720, many stockholders went bankrupt, and the Duke of Chandos suffered a severe blow to his finances. O'Day argues that Cassandra Brydges was representative of the active roles such women played in managing their own monies, often by the careful investment of inheritances, jointures, or marriage settlements. Several of the letters included in

the collection show the duchess delivering advice or discussing South Sea stocks with her correspondents.

Among Cassandra Brydges's activities, even before she married, was matchmaking. The duke also was active in the ongoing campaigns of finding suitable mates for marriageable women who had appealed to them for help. The Brydges often took young female relatives into their home for the purpose of finding appropriate marriage partners, frequently investing on their behalf to create or increase marriage portions, thus providing an entire program of improvement and rendering the prospective brides more desirable in the marriage market. It is clear that the duchess was particularly effective at this task, though a number of letters register disappointment and include subtly-worded warnings of dismissal to those who do not readily accept the marriage partners selected for them by the ducal couple.

The letters in O'Day's compilation are from what the editor refers to as the "Copy Letter Book," owned by the North London Collegiate School and comprising the duchess's copies of letters she wrote between 1713 and 1735, the year of her death. O'Day includes in her appendices letters from two additional sources: a similar copy letter book assembled from Cassandra Brydges's correspondence for the period from about 1694 to 1706, ending before her marriage (currently at the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust Record Office but owned by Stoneleigh Abbey Limited), and a collection of letters to Cassandra Brydges from 1725 to 1731, in the Stowe Collection of the Huntington Library. In addition, the duchess left a few other writings, including an incomplete history of the Willoughby family, which is now at Nottingham University Library. One major challenge O'Day faced in editing the present collection was mastering the serpentine family trees of the duke and duchess, since the letters are full of variations in the spelling of names, as well as nicknames and other confusing clues. To help the reader keep track of family relationships and correspondents, O'Day has included lineage charts and a compendium of brief biographical sketches for the people mentioned in the letters.

The only flaw in the collection is its rather frustrating structure, which depends heavily upon repetitive editorial annotations. The lengthy "Introduction" to the volume provides the biography of the Duchess of Chandos, along with context for the letters and lavish

substantive notes. The reader is directed to each of the pertinent letters that support the narrative, but the editor's commentary is duplicated in notes appended to the correspondence, as well. The result is that the reader may find the same explanation in several places, instead of further depth of information. Overall, however, O'Day's work is an excellent record, which will add to the history of women of the late-seventeenth- and early-eighteenth centuries.

Vernon Hyde Minor. *The Death of the Baroque and the Rhetoric of Good Taste*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. x + 196 pp. + 33 illus. \$80.00. Review by KATHERINE M. BENTZ, SAINT ANSELM COLLEGE.

The question of style—what it is, what it does, and why it changes over time—is perhaps one of the most central questions of the discipline of art history, and it is precisely the question that Vernon Hyde Minor examines in *The Death of the Baroque and the Rhetoric of Good Taste*. Minor's focus is eighteenth-century Italy, and in particular the Accademia degli Arcadi, a powerful group of elites who functioned as the tastemakers of *settecento* Rome. Employing the tools of post-modern critical theory, Minor investigates the waning popularity of the baroque style and the emergence of a new aesthetic influenced by Arcadian concepts of *buon gusto* (good taste) and pastoral poetics. In six discrete but related essays, each concerning different aspects of politics, literature, art and culture during the period, his book provides a densely rich discussion of artistic and literary style as a powerful discourse that directed and influenced the ideas of Italian society in the early years of the Enlightenment.

The book opens with a discussion of baroque visual rhetoric, the style so reviled by the eighteenth-century Arcadians. In his analysis of works such as Caravaggio's *Crucifixion of Saint Peter* and *Saint John the Baptist*, as well as Bernini's *Sant'Andrea al Quirinale*, Minor shows how the baroque utilizes visual effects such as spectacle, metaphor, conceit and fantasy to engender a variety of interpretative reactions and transcendent meanings in the mind of the viewer. Such effects are akin to the experiential and sensory visions taught by Ignatius of

Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises*, a text that exercised great influence on the art of *seicento* Italy. However, during a period in which Cartesian rationality and Jansenism were growing in popularity, eighteenth-century critics rejected the rhetoric and analogies of the baroque style as too saturated with Jesuit theology, and as too emotional, complex and numinous to constitute *buon gusto*.

In chapter two, Minor studies the concept of *buon gusto* and how it developed into a larger discourse during the early modern period. Good taste, he argues, was never a stable idea, but a "marker in the game of discourse, a term used for persuasion and control," and one that varied with its use in every context (27). By the seventeenth century, an earlier notion of taste referring to qualities of beauty and harmony had developed a social dimension, defined as an innate quality of discernment possessed by members of the nobility. In the eighteenth-century, concepts of *buon gusto* formed the heart of debates between French and Italian theorists on the use of language in defining national identity; became the springboard for advocating a reform movement of enlightened intellectualism in an Italian "Republic of Letters"; and was steering theorists to link ideas of beauty to the imagination and the genre of the pastoral. Perhaps the most important contribution of this chapter concerns the writings of Lodovico Antonio Muratori (d.1750). Though probably unknown to many readers of his book, Minor shows that Muratori was a significant Enlightenment thinker whose discussions of taste, judgment and the beautiful in many ways anticipated those of Kant and later eighteenth-century philosophers.

Chapter three turns to the pastoral as topos, subject, style and mood. Minor's aim here is to show the ways in which the pastoral and *buon gusto* informed and inflected each other within Arcadian discourse, and by extension, the discourse of eighteenth-century Italian art and culture. Through an analysis of paintings by Trevisani, van Bloemen and Maratti, as well as the art criticism of Diderot and Giovanni Mario Crescimbeni, Minor demonstrates how the pastoral mode in art draws the viewer into a fictional reality, one that revels in discontinuity, narrative rupture, fantasy, lyricism, and a sense of loss and nostalgia for an irretrievable Golden Age. That this aesthetic is starkly opposed to the baroque becomes obvious through Minor's brilliant analysis of the

tombs of baroque artist Bernini and eighteenth-century sculptor (and Arcadian Academy member) Filippo delle Valle. Where the baroque utilizes spectacle, celebrates allegorical and multivalent meanings, and speaks to the transcendent, Arcadianism, drawing on the pastoral, instead focuses on the pleasurable and charming, self-absorption, rationality and clarity. Notions of *buon gusto* were both “proscriptive and prescriptive,” and came to represent the sensibilities of the aristocracy and intelligentsia in promoting a new Italian culture over the excess and bad taste of the baroque style and Jesuit ideology (80-81). If *buon gusto* was the “text” of *settecento* aesthetics, posits Minor, then Arcadianism, which promulgated the mode of the pastoral in all aspects of cultural production, was its “subtext” (84).

Buon gusto and pastoralism did not always work together in harmony, however, as Minor explains in chapter four. Using the Trevi Fountain as his example, he asks whether we can characterize architecture as Arcadian. While the Trevi Fountain contains many elements of the pastoral, he points to elements of the grotesque appearing in the monument—elements that depart from the strictures of *buon gusto*. The important point Minor makes here is that like any stylistic mode, pastoralism did not fit neatly into a single category and instead often complicated and challenged the “text” (*buon gusto*) from within.

In chapter five we learn the history of the Accademia degli Arcadi and its leading founder, Giovanni Mario Crescimbeni (d.1728). This institution, with its members hailing from the upper echelons of society (aristocrats, prelates, scholars, artists, and poets), took up the cause of *buon gusto* as part of the broader movement of *settecento* cultural reform. Under Crescimbeni’s guidance (despite a short-lived leadership schism in 1711), the academy expanded to thirty-six “colonies” all over Italy. The influence of Arcadianism was thus widespread in learned culture, and thus, argues Minor, understanding the Arcadian ideology helps us to understand eighteenth-century taste.

The final chapter centers on the Bosco Parrasio, the garden on the Janiculum Hill in Rome in which the Arcadians held their gatherings. Here Minor analyzes the layout, sculptural program and iconography of the garden, but moves beyond creating a catalog of symbolic motifs to discuss the performative aspects of the space and how these generated particular “pastoral-Arcadian hermeneutics” (157).

Indeed, the plan of the garden, its sculpture and its inscriptions were not simply a backdrop for the poetry readings and play-acting of Arcadians dressed in shepherd costumes. It was rather a space that enacted the pastoral in its pathetic reminiscence of the distant past, in its production of mood and relaxation in the service of *otium*, and in its lack of resolution or logical narrative conclusion as an experiential space. The Bosco Parrasio was the very quintessence of pastoralism in the service of *buon gusto*, operating at the heart of Arcadian poetics.

Minor's book is not a comprehensive historical account of the period, nor does it claim to answer in absolute or definitive terms why the baroque style was eclipsed by a new aesthetic in the eighteenth century. This is one of the great strengths of Minor's study, for the question of style is multifaceted, and cannot be answered in simple terms. He offers instead sharp historical analysis and insight into the political and social climate that contributed to and helped to create a critical shift in aesthetic taste. Another strength of Minor's study is his illuminating reading of works of art, architecture and literature, which draw upon a dazzling array of theoretical approaches. His use of semiotics and reception theory, to highlight just two examples, provide the reader with model approaches for future art-historical interpretation. But perhaps the greatest contribution of Minor's book is his ability to explicate the cultural discourse and institutional powers that produced works of art and facilitated their appreciation in a period so critical to the development of the Enlightenment, and yet so often neglected by scholars.

Alexander Cowan. *Marriage, Manners and Mobility in Early Modern Venice*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007. xvi + 209 pp. + 8 illus. \$99.95. Review by R. BURR LITCHFIELD, BROWN UNIVERSITY.

This book will be of interest to historians of Venice and to those interested in the definition of nobility in Early Modern Europe generally. It focuses on proofs of nobility for the 600 non-patrician brides of Venetian nobles in the period 1589-1699. The book is well researched and well written.

The Venetian ruling elite was closed in 1297 to all but about 1500 males in 150 families, which actually enlarged the elite for a period. These were able to sit in the Senate, the *Maggior consiglio*, and the chief magistracies. Subsequently some 120 families were admitted to the nobility in exchange for large fees paid to the Republic, mostly in the period of the War of Candia in the mid-to-late seventeenth century. But through the extinction of families barely enough males were left in the eighteenth century to fill the offices they were privileged to hold. The system ended with Napoleon's suppression of the Republic in 1797. The elite defined itself as "noble" and became increasingly concerned with its purity of blood. In 1422, standing required the nobility of both parents and grandparents, in 1506 the Golden Books appeared, and in 1589 *prove di nobiltà* for non-patrician brides. The proofs were assessed by the *Avogaria di Comune*, a kind of supreme court of patrician lawyers appointed by the Council of Ten. The proofs had to be accepted by the *Avogadori* for any offspring of the marriage to be eligible to hold office.

The *prove di nobiltà* are a vast archive providing the rich detail set forth in this study. The "out" marriages were about seven percent of all patrician marriages in the years 1580-99, the only period for which comparative figures are provided. The proofs could be somewhat subjective, both as presented by the supplicants and as assessed by the *Avogadori*. Cowan eschews general legal categories, such as patricians, *cittadini*, and *popolani* in Venetian society—indeed definitions of nobility were quite varied in Italy of this period—in favor of how the matter was practically perceived. There was a basic threshold distinguishing between the exercise of *arte meccaniche* (menials, servants, laborers, prostitutes) and *vita civile*. The *Avogadori* considered such criteria as honor and modesty of behavior, dress styles, ownership of a gondola or carriage, the quality of houses, and the type of guests who frequented them. In 1607 Laura Castello's father had been a member of the Venetian College of Surgeons; her mother was a patrician. But when it was discovered that both her father and grandfather had exercised as "barber surgeons" doubt was cast on her petition.

Rejection of a petition (about 1 in 10 cases) was not, to be sure, a prohibition of marriage, only of proof of standing and of any sons holding office, and the procedure of the *Avogadori* could be

lengthy. A widow, Giustina Coleti, was investigated in 1616, but she was discovered to have married her intended patrician husband before resolution of her case, and it was thrown out. What was a Venetian patrician to do if he could not find a bride who could pass muster? Many probably remained bachelors. An interesting chapter addresses the question of concubinage and illegitimate daughters. Concubines seem to have been common in Venice, even for husbands who had both their legitimate and their illegitimate children living in their households. Illegitimate daughters could pass muster under certain conditions. Secret marriages also abounded.

Despite this wealth of information some drawbacks in this study arise from the fact that there is little or no information about the husbands, and from the fact that there is little comparison between the “out” and the “in” marriages of Venetian nobles. Some aspects of “out” marriage may have been typical of Venetian marriage customs generally, but others may not have been. The author asserts that “marriages between men of high status and lower status women all over Medieval and Early Modern Europe centered on the benefits of large dowries.” But with only the few examples for and against provided here this question is left unresolved for Venice, although the Avogadori di Comune apparently recorded the dowries of all patrician marriages, which might have been investigated. Also, not much social mobility is evident from this study. Not only were the “out” marriages only a small percentage of the total, they also came from a limited social and geographical range. In fact, 60 percent of the women investigated by the Avogadori had fathers who were patricians or nobles of the Republic (some were illegitimate daughters), or Venetian *cittadini*, and 58 per cent came from Venice. The author’s main conclusion is that Venetian noblemen chose outside brides among groups they already socialized easily with: “they publically recognized that gentility was not something over which they had a monopoly, but a system of behavior which was shared with many others” (175).

The Emblem in Scandinavia and the Baltic. Ed. Simon McKeown and Mara R. Wade. Glasgow: Glasgow Emblem Studies 11, 2006. xxvi + 340 pp. + illus. £ 21.99.

Simon McKeown, *Emblematic Paintings from Sweden's Age of Greatness. Nils Bielke and the Neo-Stoic Gallery at Skokloster.* Imago Figurata Studies Vol. 6. Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2006. vii + 280 pp. + illus. \$96.00. Review by LARS BURMAN, UPPSALA UNIVERSITY.

In 1531 Andrea Alciato's *Emblematum Liber* was published, and it started the much studied vogue for the emblem. The emblem form is basically tri-partite: it consists of an enigmatic picture with a motto and an explanatory epigrammatic text. Research has, however, shown how the emblem form influenced thinking and artistic expression in various ways. The tri-partite structure is by no means universal, especially not when it comes to applied emblematics, emblems used as meaningful decorative elements of, for example, buildings or furniture. The idea of "nude emblems" without actual pictures, was also productive (and easy to manage). The first printed sonnet in Swedish was written by the great initiator of Swedish literature, Georg Stiernhielm. Originally inspired by emblems by Camerarius and Cats, he represented himself in 1644 imaginatively as a silkworm in the fourteen-line "Emblema authoris." Through hard work the author (like the silkworm) creates a treasure out of leaves; the worm (like the author) dies as a result of its constant toil, but is reborn with wings by revitalizing forces. It is not a coincidence that the first sonnet in Swedish borrows its artistic power from the emblem genre. Stiernhielm aimed to introduce his time's modern and fashionable vehicles of intellectual creativity.

The art of the emblem was present all over Europe for a long time, and it has received a lot of scholarly interest. The two books reviewed here focus on Scandinavia and the Baltic. This part of Europe was culturally peripheral in the seventeenth- and early eighteenth centuries, but the Danish and Swedish realms were geographically vast, and the rise of Sweden as a European great power extraordinary. The cultural influx in Scandinavia was strong and quick, and it is interesting to reflect on how the rise of political influence, economic wealth and cultural import were related.

In the instructive introduction to the collection *The Emblem in Scandinavia and the Baltic* the editors point out that notwithstanding the wars and rivalries, “the Baltic region was in one sense curiously unified and co-sympathetic” (xiii). They point out the common cultural background, the Germanic character of the area, and also the common Lutheran heritage. When it comes to the Swedish “imperium” they stress the administrative coherence which opened for transmigration; Swedish rule in the Baltic territories was comparatively benign.

While much research in Scandinavia has been focused on the national situations, this collection gives a healthy eagle’s perspective. It is evident from the book that studies in the art of the emblem is a constructive approach when comparing various traditions and pioneering attempts. Thus the scholarly value of the collection as a whole is even greater than the sum of its parts.

It is valuable that two groundbreaking, older studies have been translated from Swedish and made accessible to an international audience. The volume’s article on political emblematics by Allan Ellenius was published in 1954-55, and his learned unravelling of the meaning of the frontispiece to Johannes Schefferus’s *De militia navali veterum libri quatuor* was in its time an eye-opener. Lena Rangström’s study of the Governor-General Carl Gustaf Wrangel’s series of emblematically embellished partisans (1975) sheds light on the problems of the applied emblems. A third study, Hans-Olof Boström’s article on the love emblems at the baroque castles of Ekholmen and Venngarn, was first presented in 1980 but has now been enlarged. His study of the *emblemata amatoria* shows how sensitive the wealthy Chancellor of the Realm, Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie, was to the hierarchical demands of style and genres—the emblems were placed in his wife’s rooms at Venngarn and in the summer pavilions at Ekholmen.

Emblematic programmes were obviously important in the highest Swedish aristocracy, and Julian Vasquez studies the relations between the emblems in Schering Rosenhane’s manuscript *Hortus Regius* and the corresponding frescos in his Stockholm palace. The plausible hypothesis is that the abdication of Queen Christina accounts for a number of the subtle differences between manuscript and painted frescos. I am not altogether convinced in every instance—the evidence is circumstantial—but the arguments for the hypothesis are strong.

Carsten Bach-Nielsen writes a comprehensive overview of emblematics in Denmark, and it is interesting to note the difference between the Danish examples of continental type which Bach-Nielsen presents, and the sparse emblems from Norway (then a part of Denmark) studied by Henrik von Achen. These emblems are not very sophisticated and mostly linked to the church. They reflect, however, the uses of devotional emblematics.

For a comprehensive overview of Latvian emblematics we can turn to Elita Grosmane's article. Even though Latvia cannot boast of a strong and original tradition we once again find many examples of an interested reception of the fashion. Grosmane also notes how the borders of the emblem genre can be blurred, and discusses examples of "para-emblematic phenomena" (71).

Religion and emblems south and east of the Baltic Sea is the subject of three articles: Mara R. Wade's "Sebald Meinhard's Liturgical Emblems in Danzig," Ojars Sparitis's "Dominican Pedagogy in the Emblematic Ceiling Paintings of the Parsiene Church, Latvia" and a study by Marcin Wislocki on the devotional background to the emblems and quasi-emblems in protestant churches on the southern coast of the Baltic. The uses of Daniel Cramer's *Emblemata Sacra* are the subject in Sabine Mödersheim's contribution to the volume. His heart emblems were widely influential and had a remarkable wide geographical spread.

The twelfth of the articles is by Simon McKeown, and deals with Johann Joachim Zeuner's emblematic manuscript for Carl Gustaf Wrangel, the Swedish aristocrat who already has been mentioned as the owner of emblematically embellished partisans. We are now once again on the south coast of the Baltic Sea, because Wrangel was the General-Governor of Pommerania, and Zeuner's book was a splendid but abortive attempt to further the interests of himself and of his native Stettin. Wrangel died in 1676 and Stettin fell into decline in the wars with Brandenburg. But McKeown is able to tell an interesting story of emblematic creativity as a means for social preferment. The story is given an extra twist, since the manuscript contains pictures of the castle of Stettin, which became extremely important at the rebuilding of the castle after the allied bombings in 1944.

We now turn to the other volume under consideration, written by the good story-teller Simon McKeown. His study of the emblematic paintings at Skokloster Castle in Sweden turns out to be something of a detective story. At the castle between Uppsala and Stockholm, once built by one of the most powerful of Swedish noblemen from the 17th century—the recurring Carl Gustaf Wrangel—eighteen emblematic paintings are preserved. McKeown stresses that they are unusual since they take their motifs and meaning from a printed book—Otto Vænius's *Q. Horati Flacci Emblemata*, also known as *Emblemata Horatiana* (1607). Almost no paintings from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century took their materials in full from printed sources, and McKeown states that “no comparable group of emblematic canvases from any European tradition has been recorded or documented” (8). McKeown's thorough investigation of the paintings is therefore most welcome.

McKeown shows that the paintings must have been brought to the castle after Wrangel's time, and with a inspired set of evidence—drilled holes in the frames, later documents, remnants of original gilding, a paint-smudged copy at Skokloster of Gomberville's French edition of Vænius's book etc.—he is able not only to determine the history of the paintings, but also to describe the intellectual, neo-stoic set-up of a once extremely powerful Swedish nobleman during the last turbulent years of the Swedish “Age of Greatness.”

It turns out that the paintings must have been commissioned by the field marshal and Governor-General Nils Bielke (1644-1716). Bielke was the hero of the bloody Scanian war, but the trusted confidant of King Charles XI fell from grace when the king died. He was charged with high treason and after a seven year long process he was sentenced to death in 1705. In the end the young king Charles XII commuted the sentence, and ruled that Bielke should reside at his country seat as a stranger both to the court and to Stockholm. His fall was indeed great. Bielke had been one of the most powerful politicians and generals in Europe and became a lonely land-owner north of Uppsala.

The last years had, however, some redeeming features for Bielke. He still could use his fortunes for both material and intellectual construction projects at his castle Salsta north of Uppsala. At the focus

of McKeown's investigation lies Bielke's combined stable/library/armoury—720 square meters of splendid pastimes for an elderly count, reflecting on the pranks of Fickle Fortune.

McKeown is able to prove that Bielke arranged an imposing gallery in his library, adorned by the commissioned emblematic paintings. Thus he made a suitable pictorial representation of the interests and mindframe of a well-educated nobleman in the highest social position. But Bielke chose just a number of emblems from the abundance in *Emblemata Horatiana*, and McKeown makes it plausible that at least some of these choices are explained by the biography of Bielke; there is “a more personal narrative behind the abstractions” (71). McKeown sees shadows of “aggrieved innocence of the paintings' owner” (71). Even some of the small changes in the way the printed emblems were transferred are convincingly explained as results of Bielke's personal situation. For a person who considered himself wrongly accused of treason, it was, obviously, important if centrally placed figures in the deeply meaningful emblems carry symbolic objects in the good right hand or in the unclean and ill-fated left one.

Bielke died at the eve of the reign of Charles XII. The library was moved by the heirs to Skokloster; the paintings were forcibly dismantled from the walls and sent with the books to the same castle. McKeown's study is not only well-researched; it is also a good example of intellectual archaeology. A puzzle of observations, material findings and scholarly learning is made into a convincing whole.

All the paintings are represented in the volume together with their counterparts in Vænius, including the texts. The plates are also accompanied with Gomberville's explanations in the translation of Thomas Mannington Gibbs (1721), and with commentaries by McKeown.

Katherine Ibbett. *The Style of the State in French Theater, 1630-1660. Neoclassicism and Government*. Farnham, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009. vii + 176 pp. + 4 illus. \$99.95. Review by MICHAEL MEERE, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

The Style of the State invites us to look differently. With this book, we get a glimpse of what is behind the imposing and, at times, dusty

edifice that is French seventeenth-century theater. To this effect, Katharine Ibbett reexamines Corneille and his generation of playwrights in the light of reason-of-state political thought, including polemical texts that emerged during the *Fronde* (1648-52) and Counter-Reformation, Machiavellian politics, colonial policies, and the cardinal de Richelieu's political legacy. Challenging the commonplace notion of a "depoliticization" of French tragedy during the 1640s, Ibbett offers a provocative yet solidly supported demonstration of the intrinsic relations between the spectacle of theater and the spectacle of political action in early modern France.

The book is divided into five chapters and ends with a short "Coda." In the introductory chapter, also appropriately subtitled "Curious Perspectives," Ibbett takes us through the history of the formation of French neoclassicism during the nineteenth century to show that what we term "neoclassicism" is in fact a narrative construction of the Third Republic that has had surprising longevity in criticism. In this self-proclaimed "array of gripes," she highlights the pamphlets of the *Fronde* and the creation of "Frenchness" as rooted in anti-Italianism (and thus anti-Machiavellism) (23). The chapter also offers a skeptical look at the nineteenth-century opposition of Corneille's moral probity to "his alleged arch-rival Richelieu," Louis XIII's minister who has often been associated with the Florentine political theorist (15). While Ibbett suggests that this rivalry is probably untrue, she underscores the persistence of the opposition in literary history, which has made Corneille a representative of French *générosité* and integrity in contradistinction to Richelieu's "Italian duplicity" and theorists of reason of state (16). Ibbett reminds the reader of these foundational aspects of seventeenth-century literature and political theory to chip away at this monumental structure more effectively. Her task is precisely to show not how Corneille's work defies Machiavellian concepts, but how it "engages in precisely th[e] stratagems" of reason of state (17).

From a methodological point of view, Ibbett explains how the political legacy of Corneille in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries has created rifts within literary criticism, "pitting attention to style, as the domain of the right, against sociology, the preserve of the left" (20). The author takes a diplomatic stance by not taking sides; rather,

she adopts a two-prong approach, bringing together French and American perspectives on this period. Ibbett is mostly concerned, she claims, with “ways of doing, with practices in both government and theater, and with the changes in staging that usher in the neoclassical drama and thus the crafting of a new genre of what came to be called ‘regular’ tragedy” (23). Thus, Ibbett structures her book by raising a particular political question in each chapter and then reading literary texts either alongside or against it. Her eloquent and engaging style and the overall structure of the book are admirable.

The next chapter reads two non-canonical, martyr tragedies of the 1640s as support for the “Politics of Patience” promulgated by the Counter-Reformation government. Ibbett argues that, instead of focusing on the martyr’s body and suffering, like in medieval hagiography, Puget de La Serre’s *Thomas Morus* (1640) and Saint-Balmon’s *Les Jumeaux martyrs* (1650) shy away from the martyr figure’s resistance to the established power and (noble) suffering to zoom in on the so-called “secondary” female characters who *wait*. By analyzing the unspectacular depiction of martyrs in painting and tragedy, Ibbett suggests that the spectator figured on stage, the woman-in-waiting, is no longer a merely pitiful character, but rather “is held to be a model to be followed” (48).

From here, Ibbett concentrates on Corneille and does not turn back. In Chapter three, we continue to read about martyrs, Polyeucte and Théodore, but instead of promoting a domestic policy of patience, Ibbett argues that, as Corneille’s plays are set on the outskirts of the Roman Empire, we can, and should, “think of a play as a colonial government, or, more pointedly, of a playwright as being like a colonial governor” (60). In turn, *Polyeucte* and *Théodore* lead us to questions of colonialism, the governing of subjects abroad, and the problem of conserving bodies as they relate to the particular vocabulary of the reason of state politics and the conservation paradigm (67). Hence, instead of judging or giving reasons to *Polyeucte*’s success and *Théodore*’s failure, like much criticism sets out to do, Ibbett is more concerned with “the political response to the body of the martyr, and the strategic attempt to keep that body in life” (76). Through close readings, we come to realize the polyvalence of the term *conserver*: we can conserve honor, love, bodies, and virginity, of course, but we can also think

of Corneille's martyr plays in terms of a "conservative paradigm of reason of state" by which bodies are managed rather than eliminated for the good of the state (90).

Chapter four, titled "Taking One's Time, or, Cléopâtre is Corneille," suggests that Corneille's favorite tragedy *Rodogune* manipulates the keeping and disclosing of secrets, and, broadly speaking, temporality, and, in turn, "explores the theatrical dimension" of how early modern rulers made decisions and practiced power in the discourses of reason of state. Ibbett thus analyzes time and timing in *Rodogune* in relation to political strategies, elaborating the analogy between "the practices of theater" and "the practices of politics" (96-97). Notably, through another close reading, we see how suspense and effect are results of both politics and theater: the coming to terms with the contingent, dissimulation, and the "end-inflected and endless manipulation of circumstances" are all elements of a Machiavellian ruler like Cléopâtre and of a playwright like Corneille (114-15). The ("productively naïve") parallel has limits, however, for Cléopâtre "ultimately fails" whereas "Corneille's liberty in conserving the effects of the story succeeds. Her secrets are given up in the movement of the final act itself, but Corneille retains the power that she loses" (121).

"The Rules of Art," is ingeniously the last chapter, for it tackles the question of theory *after* discussing theater and political practices, hence challenging critics who tend to consider seventeenth-century literature practice as a result of theory. Ibbett, of course, argues the contrary, and elucidates connections between the cardinal de Richelieu's *Testament*, "an exemplar of the genre of reflection on past political action," and Corneille's *Trois Discours sur le poème dramatique* (132). We come to consider Corneille's *Discours* as a mark of "inquiry into the bounds of theater, and into the bounds of the playwright's role," for, as Ibbett argues, "Corneille uses the language of government to create his own terrain and sovereignty" (152).

This is a book that approaches the foundational texts of French neoclassicism "from different angles and through the prism of other sorts of plays" and, as a whole, it succeeds brilliantly in its endeavor "to show how a different relation to neoclassical theater opens up a different perspective on the state" (155). All the same, one necessary criticism to make of Ibbett's first monograph would be her sporadic

oversights and sweeping statements that arguably require nuance. For example, when discussing the staging of the martyr tragedies in Chapter two, Ibbett posits that “the crux of the martyrological narrative is the relation between victim and audience, between the exemplary figure and those who follow in his, or increasingly her, wake.” “In the plays of these years,” Ibbett continues, “such a relation was necessarily troubled as the seemingly defining moment of the martyr play was pushed off stage. In the new martyrological theater, the spectator is left stranded, waiting to see something whose importance is continually stressed but which can never come about in our presence” (38). Not physically showing the martyr’s death, however, has precedent and is thus not so new: in fact, several earlier hagiographical tragedies, such as Laudun d’Aigaliers’ *Dioclétien* (1596), Pierre Troterel’s *Sainte Agnès* (1615) and Etienne Poytevin’s *Sainte Catherine* (1619), the latter both about female martyrs, do not stage the saints’ demise. Nonetheless, such pitfalls are rare and, overall, Ibbett’s project is a fruitful contribution to scholarship. The unlikely and unexpected connections throughout the book lead to perspicacious insights that will certainly nourish the future of French seventeenth-century studies.

Fernand Hallyn, *Descartes: Dissimulation et Ironie*. Geneva : Droz, 2006. 214 pp. 18€. Review by REBECCA WILKIN, PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY.

A materialist masquerading as a metaphysician? A dogmatist in disguise? Descartes’ confident prose continues to spur readers to search out contradictions and confusion: telltale ripples on a too-smooth surface. In *Descartes: Dissimulation et Ironie*, Fernand Hallyn provides vocabulary for understanding the discrepancies that readers past and present have alleged between Descartes’ thought and his expression of it. Ferrying deftly between the specifics of rhetorical strategy and the larger controversies into which words played, Hallyn sheds light on the constraints surrounding scientific discourse as well as on the passionate reactions inspired by Descartes’ philosophy and person. Dissimulation—that tool of the free-thinking atheist—was a frequent feature of Descartes’ expression; mistrust thus was (and remains) a rational response to his writing. Yet Hallyn’s purpose is

neither to inculcate Descartes as a libertine, nor to defend him from such accusations. Rather, he argues that distinguishing mask from face is preliminary to properly understanding Descartes' thought. Hallyn uses Descartes' unpublished writings—the *Treatise on the World* that he held “in reserve,” his more candid correspondence, the interview with Francis Burman—to reconstruct his process and priorities in his published works.

Hallyn defines the historical and rhetorical backdrop in the introduction and in Chapter one. In the wake of Galileo's trial, dissimulation—which Castiglione had recommended to courtiers as a facet of the art of prudence—became equally advisable for the natural philosopher. Francis Bacon considered dissimulation the middling degree of prudent veiling, between mere discretion and outright simulation. To dissimulate was to prevent just anybody from extravagant interpretation; to protect oneself against accusations of heterodoxy; to create an elite community of those who were “in” on the secret—who were sensitive, in Hallyn's terms, to the provocative “perlocutionary” effects of an apparently orthodox “illocution” (23). Descartes' early statement, *larvatus prodeo* (“I advance masked”), evinced precocious prudence: to unmask false sciences, one had to first mask oneself (33-37). Yet the mask must be undetectable, for dissimulation was the hallmark of libertine discourse.

Mostly, Descartes dissimulated in order to avoid Galileo's fate while supplanting Aristotelian physics with his mechanism, as Hallyn shows in chapters two and three. Whereas Galileo promoted heliocentrism through confrontational dialogue, Descartes adopted the “sermo,” a private conversation in the context of tranquil idleness, in which he imagined the world's creation (94). Descartes nonetheless judged his *Treatise on the World* too risky to publish; he published (anonymously) in its place the *Discourse on Method* and accompanying essays. Out of prudence, the philosopher suppressed the metaphysics from the *Discourse* and added the four rules of moral conduct at the eleventh hour (59). Sometimes, he signaled suppressions ostensibly to exercise his reader's sagacity, but really to dissimulate shortcomings in his arguments (97-105).

In chapter four, Hallyn elucidates equivocation in Descartes' efforts to placate the theologians of the Sorbonne in his *Metaphysi-*

cal meditations. The *Meditations* posed as foundational principles in harmony with Catholic dogma, as if paving the way for his physics, when in fact they served to justify Descartes' mechanistic natural philosophy *a posteriori* (126). The "meditations" promised in the title were moreover misleading: senses are central to spiritual meditation, while Descartes envisages the achievement of epistemological salvation through detachment from the senses and rational meditation—freedom from error, rather than from sin (111-114). Did Descartes really write the *Meditations* in hopes of bringing infidels to the faith? His proof of God's existence, Hallyn notes, only sustains a vague deism (134, 139). Is grace the key to faith or were the Pelagians right to acquire faith through reason? Hallyn underscores inconsistencies in the philosopher's responses (133-142). Descartes made a point of inviting theologians to correct his work, but Pierre Gassendi, reviving Aristotle's opposition of the *alazon* (braggard) and the *ieron* (dissimulator), argued that the philosopher's show of deference clashed with Descartes' manifest confidence elsewhere, and that from this dissonance emerged the sure sound of dissimulation. Hallyn cites in support of Gassendi's perceptiveness a letter in which Descartes aspires to "accommodate" Catholic dogma to his philosophy (132).

Hallyn notes that by the time Descartes published the *Meditations*, his bid to silence skeptics and chasten atheists with a watertight proof of God's existence had been brewing for about a decade (148). Hallyn nevertheless joins other recent commentators in suggesting that Descartes prioritized science over metaphysics and in characterizing the *Meditations* as a momentous detour from a narrower path of interest to which Descartes was never able to fully return, given the wake he unsuspectingly plowed with that work. Indeed, Hallyn argues in chapter five, the penultimate chapter and the keystone of the book, that the *Meditations* embroiled Descartes in a "situational irony" of which he was not the master, and in denial of which he redefined the preoccupations of western philosophy. Hallyn explores the consequences of irony—a form of simulation to the extent that it involves saying other than what one thinks—in the proof of God's existence and veracity. The *malin genie*, a demonic ironist, supposedly finds his illusions dispelled by Descartes when he proves God's existence and veracity. Yet these hyperbolic constructions leave loose

threads (157). The argument that God, as a perfect being, would never trick us, contradicts Descartes' claim elsewhere that for God, nothing is impossible (155). Likewise, Descartes' doctrine of eternal truths undermines moral certitude; the "good" is just one among others that God might have willed for us (163). (Correction: Descartes writes of free will to Elizabeth of Bohemia, not "Elisabeth de Bavière" [161]. Bavaria was the land of Maximilian I, who assisted the arch-Catholic Hapsburg Ferdinand II in deposing Elizabeth's father from the throne of Bohemia and pushing him out of the Palatinate). While in reassuring passages, Descartes reduces God to an anthropomorphic being incarnating the philosopher's ideal, in other passages this same God exercises the potential for irony, which Descartes ascribes to the *malin génie*. If Hallyn identifies a smokescreen in the *Meditations*, it is not, as Gassendi suspected, in the enabling rhetoric of a materialist, but rather in the denial of the relativism that inheres in Descartes' arguments.

Hallyn underscores the polemical context of Descartes' *oeuvre* in the final chapter, concluding that seasoned dissimulators are not above exposing the less subtle dissimulation of others when it suits them. Under attack by Henricus Regius, a former follower in once-friendly Holland, Descartes aggressively accused the disillusioned disciple of dissimulating materialist tendencies. Descartes was a slippery dissimulator—hard to catch in the act of dissimulating—because unlike Regius, he was careful to avoid the affirmation of a double truth, wherein what is true in natural philosophy contradicts what is true in faith (184, 16-18).

In *Descartes: Dissimulation et Ironie*, René casts the shadow of a tragic hero. He harbored a fatal flaw—certitude bordering on dogmatism—that condemned his writing to a hermeneutics of suspicion ever after. Yet it was not in circumventing obstacles (ignorance, bad faith, bigotry) that Descartes' unparalleled rhetorical skill—including, most prominently, dissimulation and simulation—had its greatest impact. Rather, Hallyn shows, it was because of Descartes' failure to control the irony he introduced in the name of certitude that his thought became so crucial for subsequent philosophers. Scholars and students of rhetoric and literature, as well as historians of science and of philosophy, can savor the drama of this irony thanks to the deep knowledge of rhetorical tradition that Hallyn brings to bear on all

facets of Descartes' work in this rich and densely argued book, which would have been greatly enhanced by an index.

Alain Rey. *Antoine Furetière: Un précurseur des Lumières*. Paris: Fayard, 2006. Pp. 203. 19€. Review by DAVID EICK, GRAND VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY.

Alain Rey is not a university professor but rather France's foremost lexicographer and is a household name as the longtime host of a popular, daily segment on the public radio station France Inter. As editor-in-chief of the Robert dictionaries since the 1960s, his practical experience renders him uniquely qualified to assess the work of the most important lexicographer of the Classical Age in *Antoine Furetière: Un précurseur des Lumières* (Fayard, 2006). Rey effectively launched modern Furetière studies in 1978 with his commanding introduction to a reprint of Furetière's 1690 *Dictionnaire universel*. In the interim, Furetière's dictionary and literary work has received some scholarly attention, and the field of "metalexicography," the study of dictionaries, has burgeoned. So this reviewer was eager to see what was new in Rey's return to a subject whose study he pioneered.

In the event, precious little is new. Except for a few minuscule revisions—two new pages on minor seventeenth-century French dictionaries by Jesuit Fathers Pomey and Danet, new section breaks and sub-chapter headings, and a bibliographical reference to a letter previously thought nonextant—the text is a reprint of Rey's 1978 introduction, a fact nowhere indicated in the volume. This said, the availability of Rey's seminal study in monograph form is a boon for scholars. It remains an excellent starting place for those interested in the author of the most complete picture that we have of the French language in the era of Racine, La Fontaine and Boileau, fellow members of the Académie française whom Furetière counted as friends until controversy erupted upon his announcement of the imminent publication of his *Dictionnaire universel* in 1684.

The book covers four areas: Furetière's biography as a man of letters and Academician, a play-by-play of his bitter polemic with the

Académie and his desperate attempt to get his dictionary published, an account of the dictionary's reception, and Rey's own appraisal of it.

Rey deftly inscribes Furetière's upwardly mobile professional trajectory, which culminated in a precipitous tumble from institutional grace, within seventeenth-century France's literary field, which is richly evoked. Incorporated in 1635 by Richelieu in order to, in the words of Paul Pellisson, "nettoyer la langue des ordures qu'elle avait contractées," the Académie française was commissioned to monitor literary production and author a dictionary, plus volumes on grammar, rhetoric and poetics. The latter three projects were quickly dropped, and work on the dictionary dragged on for decades. Admitted to the Académie in 1662, upon encountering his fellow Immortels' "étonnante tradition d'incompétence et de paresse," in Rey's elegant formulation, Furetière began composing his own dictionary on the sly. Fearing precisely such competition, in 1674 the Académie successfully petitioned Colbert, himself an Académicien, for an exclusive privilege over French dictionaries in France. Yet the Secrétaire of the Académie himself, Charpentier, somehow signed off on Furetière's request for his own *privilege* in August 1684. How did this happen? Rey buys Furetière's own account of having invited Charpentier for dinner and slipped him the sheet to sign when the latter was the worse for drink. Mortified upon learning that one of their own was about to contravene their monopoly over the genre, the Immortels voted to expel Furetière from their ranks. Worse, they obtained the revocation of Furetière's *privilege* in March 1685 (a few months before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—"une foi, une loi, un roi, et un dictionnaire," as Jean-Pol Caput quipped.) Furetière's reaction was to plead his case, to both the king and the nascent literary public, in three *Factums* published in 1685 and 1686. These are mordantly funny, and it's unfortunate that Rey does not quote from them more extensively. Bayle reported in his *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, in which he covered the polemic over the course of six different issues, that Furetière's *Factums* "ayant été lu au Roi, le fit extrêmement rire." Moved to laughter, the king nevertheless was not moved to action in Furetière's favor. Exhausted by the affair, Furetière died at sixty-eight in 1688. Before he died, however, he had made arrangements with Reinier Leers, Bayle's publisher in Rotterdam, where the *Dictionnaire*

universel was published in 1690 and promptly smuggled back into France, where its sales were robust. Rey reports an extraordinary coincidence: on 24 August 1694, Leers traveled to Versailles to present a copy of Furetière's dictionary to Louis XIV, the very day on which a delegation from the Académie presented to Louis its just finished dictionary, nearly sixty years in the making. Racine wrote to Boileau that the king visibly preferred the Furetière version.

Indeed, Louis could have easily discerned the superiority of the *Dictionnaire universel* in a cursory side-by-side comparison. It is apparent at a glance that the *Dictionnaire universel* surpasses its competitor in terms of content, with more entries and longer articles. Whereas the Académie obsessed over "le bon usage," omitting words considered unbecoming for the highborn, Furetière included them. As Rey notes, Furetière's innovation was to indicate their register: archaic ("vieux"), technical ("terme de médecins, etc.), vulgar ("bas"), or regional. Also salient are the curious groupings occasioned by the Académie's attempt to organize entries by root word, instead of simple alphabetical order. For example, one finds these entries in the following order: GERER, GESTION, GERONDIF, GESTE, GESTICULER, GESTICULATION, DIGERER, DIGESTIF, INDIGESTE, INDIGESTION, INGERER, SUGGERER, SUGGESTION. However erudite and enlightening one finds these etymological groupings, the dictionary's usefulness as a reference work was patently vitiated by its ordering principle. Japed Furetière in his third *Factum*, "On a de la peine à s'abstenir de rire, quand on trouve le mot digérer comme un composé de gérer. A ce compte, il faudrait dire que l'estomac est celui qui gère les affaires du ventre quand il digère de la viande."

In one other change from the 1978 version of Rey's text to the present volume, the title has shifted from *Antoine Furetière: imagier de la culture classique* to *Antoine Furetière: un précurseur des Lumières sous Louis XIV*. That both descriptors are applicable is indicative of Furetière's ambiguities and contradictions, which Rey does not shy away from: at once a fervent devotee of the monarchy and a critic of Old Regime institutions and practices; a sycophant benefiting from sinecures and a maverick harbinger of a free market for intellectual work; intolerant of the lower social orders while valorizing the terms employed by artisans and laborers; intolerant of Protestants—at least in examples of

usage found in his definitions of words including EMPESTER, EMPOISONNER, ERREUR, INFECTER, and SÉDUIRE—Furetière found refuge for his dictionary among the Huguenots of Holland.

One cannot help but remark certain affinities in the positions and practices of Furetière and Rey. Like Furetière, Rey has been silenced by the French government. In 2006 Rey was fired from his radio show by the head of Radio France, Jean-Paul Cluzel, an appointee of French president Nicolas Sarkozy. Like Furetière, Rey promotes an inclusive view of language which causes some elites to shudder; two of his recent titles are *L'Amour du français, contre les puristes et autres censeurs de la langue* (Denoël, 2007) and *Lexik des cités* (Fleuve noir, 2007), a dictionary which grants citizenship to the language of the youth of France's troubled suburbs. Finally, like Furetière, Rey competes against the Académie française and works more productively, updating the *Petit Robert* in new editions year after year, while over seven decades have passed since the last complete edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, its eighth, was published in 1932.

Marion Kobelt-Groch and Cornelia Niekus Moore, eds. *Tod und Jenseits in der Schriftkultur der Frühen Neuzeit* (Wolfenbütteler Forschungen; vol. 119). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2008. 243 pp. + 26 illus. 69€. Review by FRANK SOBIECH, UNIVERSITÄT TRIER, GERMANY.

This interdisciplinary and interconfessional volume resulting from a conference held at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, Germany, from 3-5 May 2006 deals with concepts of death, the afterworld, and salvation in Early Modern Western Europe, especially the German-speaking territories. It is characterised by its claim to deal not only with “death,” but to connect it with the hope of an afterworld, which was an integral part of “death” then. The different concepts of that hope are traced here especially for the Lutheran tradition. First, I will sketch the contents of the seven English and six German articles, which are with no exception of high quality:

After the German introduction by the editors, SUSAN C. KARANT-NUNN presents an overview on the relationship between popular belief of the laity and Lutheran clergymen and state authorities concerning

practically eminent theological questions. It anticipates many of the following themes of the volume.

ROBERT KOLB clarifies how the attitude toward death—fear and sorrow, and, as sign of a true Christian, confidence in the victory of Christ over sin—develops in four literary genres of the mature Martin Luther, beginning with his “Sermon on Preparing to Die” (1519).

BRUCE GORDON sketches the Zurich reformator Heinrich Bullinger’s (1504-1575) carefully constructed statements—due to church politics—on the deaths of Huldrych Zwingli and Luther, both of whom had played a coequal role in his own spiritual formation.

MARION KOBELT-GROCH presents Lutheran funeral sermons for unbaptized newborns, which had not only the task of consoling the bereaved, but also to keep clean confessional identity (against the so-called Anabaptists, Papists, and Calvinists) and of “social disciplining” (cf. 74).

On the basis of miracle stories and lawsuits, EVA LABOUVIE shows that the religious folkway of emergency baptism for newborns, which were supposed to have been “reanimated” for a short period of time with the help of the intercession of Mary or special saints, was a widespread use especially in Switzerland, France, and the German territories in Catholic and Lutheran environment since the fifteenth century. Parents did not accept death as a fate, but practised loving care, which provides proves against Philippe Ariès’s opposing thesis (84; cf. 74).

HARALD TERSCH analyses housebooks and family registers, which always stood in the shadow of the mass source “testaments.” Spread more numerous in European cities since the fourteenth century and mostly written by merchant and entrepreneurial families, they also summarized donation letters and were influenced by their confessional background.

BERNHARD LANG shows how William Blake’s (1757-1827) drawing “The meeting of a Family in Heaven,” as part of an illustrated edition (1808) of Robert Blair’s (1699-1746) poem “The Grave” offers a conclusion to the Puritan John Bunyan’s (1628-1688) two-part novel “The Pilgrim’s Progress”: displaced in the poem, it was originally conceived for the novel. Bunyan only hints at heavenly reunion, though his novel’s second part (1684) is more anthropocentric, but

without completely replacing the theocentric image of heaven of the first part (1678).

PIET VISSER presents an analysis of the manifold metaphor of the Heavenly City in Dutch Mennonite Edifying Literature in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In this context, he comes to speak of the “martyrs’ songs” (148) of the clandestinely published “Offer des Heeren” (before 1562). Not mentioned here, but related are the “Marter-Gesenge” of the “Ausbund” (1570/71), the song book of the South German Anabaptists, still in use with the North American Amish (cf. Peter Burschel: *Sterben und Unsterblichkeit. Zur Kultur des Martyriums in der frühen Neuzeit*, München 2004, 117 f.). Martyrdom is a topic which can be traced also in other articles (25, 51). Finally, Visser brings his analysis into line with the Old Flemish Mennonite Karel van Mander’s (1548-1606) painting “Crossing of the Jordan.”

BERND ULRICH HUCKER discusses the connections between the different traditions of the tomb inscriptions and the burial of the historically ambivalent court jester Thyl Ulenspiegel (+ 1350 in Mölln, North Germany).

MICHAEL PROSSER-SHELL sheds light on the Catholic theological tradition concerning the unbaptized children, who were born dead or died during the parturition in the late Middle Ages and Early Modern times. Still a problem is whether the theory of the “*limbus puerorum*” was known and accepted by mourning parents. Consolatory afterworld concepts and the “*exercitus furiosus*” of popular theology show that parents often panicked.

NORBERT FISCHER deals with the development of sepulchral culture (inscriptions, symbolism) especially in the Protestant North Germany from Early Modern times to the nineteenth century, which underwent a fundamental change in the late eighteenth century.

EILGEEN DUGAN presents Salome Haußmännin, a 23 year old Nördlingen woman who was sentenced to death for infanticide in 1715—a theme which is also mentioned in two other articles (76 f., 92 f.)—and whose edifying story was composed and published by Lutheran pastor Georg Matthäus Beckh (1656-1717). In its centre stood the spiritual regeneration of the condemned—comparable to the New England Puritanist criminal conversion narrative, but with some differences.

CORNELIA NIEKUS MOORE concentrates on the spiritual relationship between the Lutheran Augusta Elisabeth von Posadowsky (1715-1739) and Johann Adam Steinmetz (1689-1762), who wrote her memorial biography and edited her collected poems. Influenced by his sermons as abbot of Cloister Berge in Magdeburg, her poems show the same spirituality of seeking the spiritual happiness in heaven and Christ as waiting bride.

To summarize, this volume, with contributors from Germany, Austria, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Great Britain, and the USA provides a profound outlook on a field which proves promising for future research. Coherent thematic lines (e.g. the status of unbaptized newborns), the well-composed order of the articles, and expressive illustrations make the book highly readable. Everyone interested in the vast fields of cultural history, European ethnology, the history of religious thought and popular religious literature, the relationship between theology and literature, and art historians will read and use this book with profit. A desideratum can be recognized first in the fact that research in the Catholic tradition is under-represented. This is due to the research situation in general, which is dominated by meritorious research in Protestant spirituality—insofar the volume is a true portrayal of actual research activities. Second, and that goes beyond the achievement of the articles of the present volume, I would greet intensified interconfessional dialogue in research. Also the dialogue between theology/history of Christendom and “profane” history should be reinforced. A special emphasis I would lay hereby upon the comparison of the different theological concepts and cultures: Did they have a common origin? Existed mutual influences (cf. e.g. 154)? What were their consequences for individual and social human life? What are their impacts on today’s both religious and “profane” world? These are, from my point of view, some fundamental outlines for future research. Finally, besides the index of persons, the reader would for sure also have welcomed some information about the authors, for research is always embedded in an individual story of a human being’s life.

Anna Linton. *Poetry and Parental Bereavement in Early Modern Lutheran Germany*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. xvi + 319 pp. \$110.00. Review by SUSAN R. BOETTCHER, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

Anna Linton's book, the revision of her doctoral dissertation, concerns itself with the problem of the high child mortality of the early modern period as it is reflected in literature, or more specifically, the issue of poetic responses to the death of a child among Lutheran authors in early modern Germany. As sources, she uses sixteenth- and seventeenth-century commemorative poetry, books of consolation, and funeral publications found at the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel and the Forschungsbibliothek Gotha. In six well-written and compact chapters, Linton covers the history of Lutheran consolation; the rhetorical purposes and goals of poetry; the models that were influential on poem authors and the different metaphors these authors used to express their grief or their sympathy; the pedagogical aims of Lutheran discussions of death; several particular sorts of imagery employed by poem authors; and, finally, the oeuvre of two notable authors of consolation poetry, Paul Fleming and Margarethe Susanne von Kuntsch (who wrote in response to the deaths of thirteen of her fourteen children and seven grandchildren). In addition to footnotes, bibliography and an index, Linton provides brief biographies for the authors of the works she cites. Two chapters reproduce material from article-length publications elsewhere. Source texts are presented only in German. The main programmatic goal of the work is to rehabilitate occasional poetry as a subject for literary scholarship, but the book delivers a great deal of interesting information and context about the culture of later Lutheranism along the way.

Pointing to the high frequency of memorial poems about deceased children published by both parents and family friends of the deceased, Linton adds to the abundant evidence against the charge by scholars such as Philippe Ariès and Lawrence Stone that early modern parents lacked emotional attachment to their children. The models for such poetry are laid out in the early chapters of the book; Linton is particularly concerned with the classical background, and notes the repeated scheme of praise, mourning, and comfort (in that order) in

the poems she analyzes, a structure that she relates to the aims early modern authors assigned to their poetry. As she notes, biblical consolation that drew on the New Testament and Hellenizing portions of the Old Testament was closely related to the mood in the works of many authors of classical antiquity. Lutheran consolation books are treated primarily as successors to the classical heritage and humanist works that many of their authors must have known. The affective rhetoric of these poems was not only classicizing, but also a tool for creating and maintaining social ties between the literate producers and consumers of such works, although this later theme is treated rather cursorily, with scant evidence of the local or social circulation of such texts offered to deepen the author's claims about social networks. Turning again to rhetoric, the author examines the formal devices for expressing grief and for executing the different tasks of the poetry she is reading. Particularly interesting is her display of a number of different visual forms in which consolation poetry was published, including hearts and crosses. In other regards, as well, this poetry frequently resorted to the formal devices of the age, including chronograms, anagrams, and paragrams. Consolation literature in general was didactic, and these poems were no exception, as they were supposed to teach their readers in particular not only about the appropriateness of grief but also about the potential danger of excessive mourning. Linton notes a few divergences of the poetry from orthodox Lutheran theology—such as the reappearance of a dead child—that she interprets as devices in support of the didactic and normative goals of the poetry. Chapter five presents two particularly frequent strands of imagery in such poems: children as plants, death as predator, life as a journey, a dead girl as a “bride of Christ” or a dead boy as a “heavenly soldier,” the latter, images that allow the reader to think of the deceased as continuing his or her life at the stage of its end, only in a heavenly rather than in an earthly home. Examples of particular authors are treated in the final chapter. The comparison of Fleming and Kuntsch in the final chapter in light of Lutheran cultural values is particularly effective given Fleming's status as poet laureate and student of that eminent versifier, Martin Opitz, versus that of Kuntsch as a typical, perhaps especially well-educated, woman of the

upper middle class. Linton uses this chapter to draw Fleming's alleged neo-Stoicism under her gaze as well.

In sum, Linton sees this Lutheran poetry as prioritizing soul over body, the group over the individual, and the living over the dead. Given the frequency with which the author makes pronouncements about the character of Lutheran consolation as a theological outcome, besides obvious audiences in the area of German literature and early modern literature more generally, this book should find readers among scholars interested in orthodox Lutheran theology and its outcomes in the cultural sphere. In these regards, however, readers may occasionally find that the analysis does not offer answers to all of the important questions it raises about some of its terms. Perhaps the most quickly apparent of these problems is the characterization of "bride of Christ" imagery as Lutheran; given the equal prevalence of this metaphor in Catholic writing of all kinds, more discussion of what makes a particular piece of cultural production "Lutheran" beyond the confessional commitments of its author would have been helpful. The discussion of Lutheran ideas on consolation in light of the classical heritage is enlightening, given how seldom this subject is discussed in much secondary literature, and Linton's discussion of moderation or "appropriate" versus disordered mourning is an important intervention in a field that often conceives of Lutheran authors as fervent polemicists who eschewed a *via media* of any kind. Occasionally, however, Linton seems to take sixteenth-century Lutheranism's rhetoric about itself at face value: the discussion of moderation (as located in the sixteenth-century treatment of appropriate mourning against disordered mourning) has been identified by scholars such as John B. Henderson as a key characteristic of orthodoxy as a religious pattern and, as Ethan Shagan has noted, was a typical claim of other confessions of the period. From time to time, the book's analysis points to ideas in Lutheran poetry that are not entirely consistent with Lutheran theological claims, but this pattern is less surprising if one considers the context of Lutheranism's emergence in late medieval *Frömmigkeitstheologie*, a connection that receives scant consideration in Linton's genealogy of ideas of consolation, which are related primarily to humanist appropriations from the classical antique (Bernard of Clairvaux does, however, make an occasional appearance). Finally,

readers who come to this book out of interest in the question with which Linton opens the work (the quality of family sentiment) may also find themselves asking questions about the social components of this consolatory activity that are not taken up in the book. It would have been particularly interesting to have learned more about the educational mechanisms by which the skill of poetry writing was transmitted.

The list of questions one may have while reading Linton's book should not detract from the scholars' impression of the quality of the analysis regarding questions that are actually targeted in the book; indeed, that one can develop so many areas of inquiry based on her research suggests the centrality of the topic and precisely the ways that Linton has opened up its discussion for future researchers.

John Whenham and Richard Wistreich, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Monteverdi*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. xxi + 358 pp. + 23 illus. \$36.99. Review by STEVEN SAUNDERS, COLBY COLLEGE.

The patrimony of this outstanding collection of essays on the seventeenth-century's most renowned composer is clear: the dedication to Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune, editors of the venerable *Monteverdi Companion* (London: Faber, 1968) and its revised version, *The New Monteverdi Companion* (London: Faber and Faber, 1985), signals that this "companion to the companions" will consist of equal measures of emulation, competition, and homage. *The Cambridge Companion* is similar to its forerunners in one respect: its authors form an impressive cadre from the A-list of Monteverdi scholars. Yet the Cambridge volume is at once more comprehensive and accessible than the earlier Monteverdi companions. That the resulting book can be read with profit by both lay readers and specialists is a tribute both to the contributors' considerable acumen and to the editors' thoughtful design.

That overarching structure consists of three intertwining strands, the first chronological: chapters on Mantua (Roger Bowers) and Venice (Ian Fenlon) introduce the social, political, and economic conditions under which Monteverdi worked during the two primary phases of his career. These two articles serve loosely as introductions to seven

chapters surveying the major works of Monteverdi's oeuvre: the early compositions (Geoffrey Chew), the third through sixth books of madrigals and *Scherzi musicali* (Massimo Ossi), *Orfeo* (Joachim Steinhauer), the *Mass and Vespers of 1610* (Jeffrey Kurtzman), the seventh and eighth book of madrigals (Tim Carter), the Venetian sacred music (John Whenham), and the late operas (Ellen Rosand).

These distinguished scholars generally concentrate on summarizing previous work on these repertoires and on introducing basic problems in Monteverdi research. For example, Chew's essay provides a lucid introduction to the ideas of musical imitation, emulation, and intertextuality; Ossi's contribution on the Mantuan madrigals neatly summarizes his distinguished earlier work on these pieces; and Kurtzman's article provides a thoughtful digest of Monteverdi's duties as a composer of sacred music at Mantua, along with an admirable review of the vexed questions surrounding the so-called *1610 Vespers*.

Despite this clear effort to address a wide readership, nearly all of the authors manage to float fresh ideas or to present new findings. For example, Tim Carter's essay—an example of the author's customary combination of meticulous scholarship, wide-ranging curiosity, and keen wit—uses the Habsburgs' well-known motto *Bella gerant alii, tu felix Austria nube* (Let others wage wars, you happy Austria marry) as a key to reading the division of the *Eighth Book of Madrigals* into *canti guerrieri* and *amorosi*. Carter's suggestion that "Monteverdi quite literally composes [the motto] into his collection" (186), which was dedicated to the Habsburg Emperor Ferdinand III, is persuasive, even though the motto itself was not widely used with reference to the Habsburgs until the eighteenth-century. Similarly, Monteverdi scholars will recognize a subtle, and not altogether consonant counterpoint between Jeffrey Kurtzman's and Roger Bowers's contributions—one that renews their ongoing contretemps over matters of Monteverdi scholarship. At issue in this case are precisely what Monteverdi meant when he asked to be named "Director of Music both of the chamber and of the church" at Mantua in his first surviving letter (28 November 1601), and which venues outside the ducal palace were probable sites for the performance of his early sacred compositions. Finally, John Whenham's discussion of the sacred works published in anthologies

provides, in less than four pages, the best overview yet of this overlooked portion of Monteverdi's output.

Five articles written from viewpoints other than the traditional life-and-works perspective constitute the book's second strand. Anthony Pryor's thought-provoking "Approaching Monteverdi: His Cultures and Ours" is a tour de force, an extended meditation on the ways in which modern points of view shape, distort, and transform our picture of Monteverdi. Among the fascinating topics he explores are the meanings attached to being an "Italian" composer in the Seicento; the distorting influences of modern ideologies of authorship, genius, and originality; the historically mutable categories of serious versus popular music; and the uses (or rather, misuses) of models of history based on notions of progress and civilization. In the midst of these ruminations on historiography, Pryor manages to work in not only new contributions to Monteverdi's biography, but also a telling demonstration of the novelty of the aria "Possente spiritu" from *Orfeo*, its surface similarities to Caccini's "Qual trascorrendo" notwithstanding. Tim Carter's contribution on "Musical Sources" offers cautionary tales regarding the problematic nature of the sources for Monteverdi's music, most notably his discovery that a later state of the first edition to *Orfeo* includes no fewer than fifty-four stop-press corrections. Carter also demonstrates the utility of thinking about the ways in which printed sources reflect their lost manuscript exemplars, or *Stichvorlagen*. Paola Besutti surveys "Spaces for Music in Late Renaissance Mantua," reconstructing the architecture of many of the spaces in which Monteverdi's works were first heard, and Suzanne Cusick provides a unique state-of-the-field survey that traces the influence of so-called "new musicologies" on Monteverdi scholarship. Cusick singles out the roles that Gary Tomlinson, Ellen Rosand, and Susan McClary played in introducing strains of new criticism, new historicism, and gender studies to Monteverdi studies. Ironically, few of the other essays in the volume evidence these trends. Most are methodologically traditional, showing few traces of critical theory, feminist scholarship, or the other approaches Cusick discusses. Indeed, even the approaches to music analysis in the *Cambridge Companion* are generally long-established ones. Most of the essays hew to traditional tonal descriptions of Monteverdi's harmonic practice. Hardly any of

the authors draw on Eric Chafe's hexachord-based approach to tonal organization or acknowledge Harold Powers' influential work on tone and mode. The last of the five complementary essays, Richard Wistreich's "Monteverdi in Performance" is not a practical treatment of seventeenth-century performance practice, though he does offer a few suggestions about performance matters, but rather an astute introduction to the resources, performers, and musical traditions with which Monteverdi worked.

Six *intermedi*, short analytical essays examining single works, form the third strand in the book's organization. Labeling these essays *intermedi* by analogy to the musical-dramatic interludes that divided the acts of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century dramas was a felicitous rhetorical touch. Nevertheless, these analyses function less as interludes than as appendages. They are invariably written by the author of the immediately preceding chapter and isolate a work from that chapter's repertoire for extended treatment. There is something invigorating about watching established scholars (Chew, Ossi, Kurtzman, Carter, Whenham, and Rosand) return to well-known compositions, still finding new and original things to observe. The understandable exception is Ellen Rosand's *intermedio* on Act V, scene 10 from *Il ritorno d'Ulisse*, drawn from her monumental *Monteverdi's Last Operas: A Venetian Trilogy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), which appeared at virtually the same time as the *Cambridge* volume.

Three additional features round out *The Cambridge Companion*. A seven-page chronology of Monteverdi's life and works by John Whenham condenses and updates the similar section of Silke Leopold's *Monteverdi: Music in Transition* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). The emphasis that Whenham places on Monteverdi's activities as a church musician provides an illuminating corrective to Leopold's overview, which tended to emphasize the composer's secular output. Whenham also contributes a useful list of "The Works of Monteverdi: Catalogue and Index" that lists works arranged chronologically by date of publication, as well as entries for lost works, interleaved(?) by date of performance. Finally, there is a brief and judiciously chosen discography by Richard Wistreich.

The emphasis on Monteverdi's music makes *The Cambridge Companion to Monteverdi* a worthy counterpart to Paulo Fabbri's standard

biography, *Monteverdi*, trans. Tim Carter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), in which the music receives rather short shrift. The book's structure leads to some inevitable redundancies when the volume is read front-to-back, but editors manage to keep these to a minimum, and in any case, many readers will consult articles separately or out of order. Ultimately, the *Cambridge Companion* provides a lucid scholarly introduction to Monteverdi's music, a succinct overview of the current state of scholarship, and enough nuggets of new research to keep even Monteverdi specialists engaged.

Laura A. Lewis. *Hall of Mirrors: Power, Witchcraft, and Caste in Colonial Mexico*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003. xvi + 262 pp. \$79.95 cloth; \$22.95 paperback. Review by PATRICIA M. GARCÍA, THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

Laura A. Lewis's *Hall of Mirrors: Power, Witchcraft, and Caste in Colonial Mexico* begins with the first of many case histories of men and women accused of engaging in, directly or indirectly, witchcraft in sixteenth and seventeenth century Mexico. Lewis relates the story of a free black woman, Adriana Ruíz de Cabrera, accused of witchcraft in the court of the Holy Office of the Inquisition. In some witness accounts, she uncovered thefts and lost items for those who sought her services. In others, she was hired to seek revenge on the enemies of her clients. Adriana's defense was her proclaimed Christianity, especially since she had been raised in a Spanish household. Adriana further noted that her accuser, another free black woman named Ana María de Concepción who had rented a room in her boarding house and subsequently stolen from other boarders, was not to be trusted not only because she was a "lying cheat" but also "because ... she is a black [woman] [*negra*]" (2). Lewis uses this seemingly ironic argument to point out Adriana's understanding of caste as she positions herself as, in her lawyer's terms, a "*clean living* black woman" in opposition to Ana María. Ultimately, Adriana was freed when Ana María admitted to lying, thus confirming Adriana's accusations. Ana María never believed that the Inquisition would take her claims seriously, as she was from the "*monte*" or the wild space of the hills or backwoods, and,

furthermore, she argued in her own defense, she had been tricked by the devil himself to make such claims.

Such negotiations of race, class, and identity in relation to sanctioned and unsanctioned realms of power in colonial Mexico form the context for Lewis's study. Sanctioned power was centered in Spanish political and religious rule as demonstrated in court records, while unsanctioned power was controlled by native Indians in the form of witchcraft. Along this trajectory of Spanish/Indian power and caste, blacks, mulattos, and mestizos formed strategic alliances with both groups in accordance with their particular needs. Such negotiations demonstrate Lewis's argument that "caste constituted a more ambiguous and flexible set of qualities that combined social affiliations, kinship, and inherent differences as it worked to facilitate incorporation into systems of power" (5). Lewis powerfully supports this assertion with meticulous readings of court records throughout the text, providing valuable insights into the public and private worlds of colonial Mexico.

Chapter one, "Forging a Colonial Landscape: Caste in Context," further defines Lewis's understanding of caste and how these such categories are connected to political economy and judicial organization. While Indians found themselves at the bottom of the caste system, they were still able to maintain power outside the system (through witchcraft) and within the system as they maintained a protected legal status exempting them from court proceedings and from enslavement. Chapter two, "The Roads are Harsh: Spanish and Indians in the Sanctioned Domain," examines such relationships as linked to essentialized idealizations of each group and how such idealizations become gendered. The Indian, characterized as feminine, needed constant supervision against the dark forces of witchcraft. Not surprisingly, Indians and women accused of witchcraft quickly put forward the argument that they had been tricked or seduced by others or by the devil himself, thus utilizing such gendered characterizations in their own defense. Chapter three, "*La Mala Yerba*: Putting Difference to Work" investigates the working relationships among caste categories, especially those moments where "mixed-casteness"

(12) necessitated a discussion about individual rights. The irony for Indians in such discussions is that they often took the blame and were punished for transgressions of sanctioned power and then suffered again in attempts to re-habilitate or cure them.

While these opening chapters focus on what Lewis terms the sanctioned realms of power, the second half of the book moves to the unsanctioned realm and its own negotiation of caste and power structure. Chapter four, "From Animosities to Alliances: A Segue into the World of Witchcraft," sees the rebellions and unions between Indians and blacks, mulattos, and mestizos working to challenge Spanish authority. Chapter five, "Authority Reversed: Indians Ascending," sees such challenges as empowering to Indians who could both curse and heal, thus gaining multiple agencies as perpetrator and protector. Lewis offers the story of a priest, Hernán Sánchez de Ordiales, a symbol of Spanish and male order, who suffered from the bewitching by the Indian Miguel Lázaro. Lázaro, he argued, sought vengeance after the priest punished him for having an incestuous relationship with his daughter. The pain caused the priest to seek treatment from other Indians who attempted to cure him. When Lázaro remains unpunished by the authorities that arrested him after his confession, the priest again punished him with a whipping. Soon after, the priest suffered new pains but cannot find any cure, even from other Indians. At this point, he contacted the Inquisition to report on such matters, convinced that the Indians in question were untrustworthy and "full of 'tricks'" (126). Interestingly, he distanced the incidents of healing witchcraft that he knowingly, and perhaps blasphemously, entered by saying that they were not "explicit pacts with the devil" (126), but says nothing of Lázaro's own witchcraft that cursed him in the first place. Lewis insightfully observes that the priest's involvement with witchcraft acknowledges a power that even his own religious authority could not overcome while distancing himself from the overtly dark forces associated with witchcraft. In Chapter six, "Mapping Unsanctioned Power," Lewis examines these darker forces in the imagining of the devil himself. The devil appeared in multiple guises and in forms appropriate to those whom witnessed him. Such mutability and hybridity reflect Lewis's larger argument that power relations are interconnected to social and genealogical affiliations, or caste.

Lewis ends her discussion with a startling example of a gender role reversal as a female mulatto slave confesses that, with the aid of herbs and magic obtained from an Indian, she was able to invoke the devil. The role reversal comes in her adoption of male dress to disguise herself, and, with the devil's empowerment, participate in the murder of various men. Moreover, most defendants who were able to make direct pacts with the devil were male. In subsequent confessions, the woman retracted her claims of murder, but maintained that she was able to communicate with the devil. It was only the supernatural appearance of San Antonio, she said, that convinced her to abandon her ways and confess all to the Inquisition. In this example, Lewis poses important questions about realms of power and the categorization of individuals in relation to such power. For this mulatto slave woman, witchcraft empowered her, but ultimately, she returned to the realm of sanctioned power that enslaved her. Such actions, Lewis concludes, demonstrate that witchcraft in colonial Mexico worked not in opposition to colonial power but rather affirmed hegemonic structures that organized both the sanctioned and unsanctioned realms into hierarchical categories of caste. Lewis's astute arguments and extensive archival research offers new perspectives on religion, class, gender and race in colonial Mexico and, at a broader level, the ways in which power is constructed.

Jonathan Sawday. *Engines of the Imagination: Renaissance Culture and the Rise of the Machine*. New York, NY, 2007. xxii + 402 pp. + 30 illus. \$33.95. Review by Scott Maisano, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT BOSTON.

The last movie Arnold Schwarzenegger made prior to becoming the Governor of California was *Terminator 3: The Rise of the Machines*. Jonathan Sawday's book about technological fantasies of the early modern period, *Engines of the Imagination: Renaissance Culture and the Rise of the Machine*, shares more than just its subtitle with this apocalyptic film. Like the Terminator himself, Sawday travels back in time in order to eliminate, once and for all, the stubborn resistance to artifice and technology that survives in—and sometimes still defines—twenty-

first-century academic work in the humanities. Sawday, moreover, goes much further back in time than his big-screen counterpart. As evidenced by the book's cover image, the right wing of Hieronymus Bosch's *Haywain Triptych* (c. 1500), Sawday's "rise of the machines" occurs long before Stanley Kubrick's Hal 9000 computer, William Blake's "dark satanic mills," or even Adam Smith's pin factory. Sawday nonetheless makes use of all these post-Renaissance machines, and many others too, as he frequently colors outside the lines while filling in "the imaginative history of machines and mechanisms within European culture between 1450 and 1700" (xv). His thesis, in short, is that "the confrontation between mechanical culture and nature," which Leo Marx had outlined in *The Machine in the Garden* (1964), is not "a peculiarly American phenomenon of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries" but, rather, a conflict that industrialized nations inherited from the European Renaissance (294-5). "How the machine came to occupy this ambiguous position" in late modernity, explains Sawday at the end of his first chapter, "represents the thread of the narrative of this book" (30). Sawday's narrative "thread," like that of Daedalus, "the legendary founder... of the mechanical arts" (215), leads the reader through a labyrinth of historical anecdotes, philosophical arguments, canonical literature, and sumptuous illustrations until, stumbling back to the future in the concluding chapter, we discover our present ambivalence toward machines somehow makes more sense as a result of all these circuitous detours. Although this reviewer ultimately found the book's dizzying copiousness and disorienting capaciousness a welcome change of pace from recent work in the areas of early modern literature and science, some readers, historians especially, might balk at its methodology or lack thereof.

Engines of the Imagination begins by going back to the classical and biblical sources, the original myths of technology—from the aforementioned Daedalus to the Tower of Babel—in order to explain how the promises and perils of machinery were understood in a pre-industrial, albeit increasingly mechanical, culture. The first chapter draws the readers' eyes (and ears) to the windmills, watermills, and furnaces that served as inspiration for fifteenth-century painters and poets alike. The second chapter focuses on Leonardo da Vinci, Michel Montaigne, and Domenico Fontana, the architect who coordinated

hundreds of men, horses, and rope and pulley systems as part of a successful effort to re-erect a 300-ton obelisk in front of St. Peter's Basilica. While the three images excerpted from Fontana's 1590 publication recounting his engineering extravaganza are among the most arresting in the entire book, Sawday's account of Montaigne's "delight in machinery" (46) and his captivation by the hydraulic automata in gardens at Tivoli and Pratolino comes as the biggest surprise. Montaigne has never looked so much like the intellectual identical twin of his seventeenth-century philosophical successor, René Descartes. The third chapter reveals the role played by sixteenth-century "machine books," particularly Georgius Agricola's *De Re Metallica* (1556) and Agostino Ramelli's *Le Diverse et Artificiose Machine* (1588), in restoring mechanics to the status of a high art, complete with expensive folios, wealthy patrons, and royal dedicatees. The fourth chapter, on "Women and Wheels," seems to stretch Sawday's thesis to its breaking point: it begins by noting how Norman Rockwell's iconic image of Rosie the Riveter drew inspiration from Michelangelo's Sistine Chapel but soon loses traction and starts spinning its own wheels—amid depictions of the Roman goddess, Fortuna, the medieval legend of Saint Catherine, martyred on a set of spiked wheels, and even Tibetan prayer wheels, which "swept China in the early twelfth century" (138)—before acknowledging, somewhat anticlimactically, that "female machine operators are not to be found in the world of Renaissance mechanical culture" (149). The fifth chapter, however, finds Sawday back on track and getting up a full head of steam. This is also where readers of *Seventeenth-Century News* will begin to pay special attention: Francis Bacon, Ben Jonson, Inigo Jones, John Donne, and the late plays of Shakespeare are brought together, productively, under the rubric of "mechanical illusions." The sixth chapter, on "Reasoning Engines," charts the rise of the "mechanical philosophy" even as it reveals how new-fangled microscopes and dildos inspired Samuel Pepys and John Wilmot, the second earl of Rochester, respectively. The seventh chapter, a tour de force, is a sustained meditation on "Milton and the Engine." Here, the reader reencounters many of the highlights from earlier chapters—the Tower of Babel, Fontana's obelisk, and Agricola's miners, to name only a few—now in the context of Milton's Hell. Suddenly, one begins to see how Sawday's book resembles the

baroque clockwork, ingenious devices, and infernal engines he has been describing all along. Like those Renaissance machines, *Engines of the Imagination* can indeed be a useful tool, but it is primarily a work of art: an elaborate and overreaching invention testifying to its maker's devilish virtuosity.

Whereas Humphrey Jennings, whom Sawday acknowledges as an inspiration for his work, had used the construction of Pandae-monium in Milton's *Paradise Lost* as the starting point for his own "imaginative history of the industrial revolution," Sawday transforms Milton's infernal tower into the terminus ad quem of a pre-industrial fascination with machines that, he argues, had actually begun centuries earlier. Sawday's portrait of a noisy, overcrowded, ink-stained, and even smoggy early modern era—especially his account of Spinhuit, Amsterdam's workhouse for vagrant women—frequently borders on the Dickensian. But Sawday's fondness for prolepsis—typified by a sentence such as "Three hundred years before that twentieth-century fascination with the fusion of machine and animal which Donna Haraway has traced to the ambiguous figure of the cyborg, [Robert] Hooke, the seventeenth-century fabricator of instruments, had already begun to see in nature a form of hybridization between mechanisms and organic life" (225)—also occasionally threatens to undermine his central claim: namely, that we are "the heirs to the mechanical culture of the Renaissance" (70). As *Engines of the Imagination* makes abundantly clear, the mechanical culture of the Renaissance was itself heir to the mechanical culture of the medieval and classical periods before it. And we are also more immediately the heirs of the industrial revolution recorded by Jennings. So why single out the Renaissance, from 1450 to 1700, as the "advent of mechanical culture" (xv)? Or identify the "rise of the machine" as the defining event of the seventeenth century? These are questions that a previous generation of cultural historians, especially those interested in what used to be called the "scientific revolution," would have attempted to answer head on. Yet, despite his sensitivity to the changing significance of matter, motion, and mathematics during these 250 years, Sawday does not use the term "scientific revolution," not even once, in more than four hundred pages. If he had, the book's narrative about the rise of machines—or, rather, "the mechanical philosophy"—in the

sixteenth and seventeenth centuries would not feel especially new or original; it would feel like traditional intellectual history. Indeed, as anyone who has read Leo Marx's *The Machine in the Garden* knows, Marx devotes more than fifty pages to an analysis of the central conflict of American literature as it appears, much earlier, in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*. Thus, when Sawday claims in his concluding chapter that "[Marx's] conceit of the 'interrupted idyll' surfaced" first in seventeenth-century pastoral literature, including Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, he is not (despite what he says) overturning or even updating Marx's argument. He is merely repeating it.

Even so, as *The Terminator* franchise makes clear, the past is always already the site of countless interferences enacted by the time-travelers—or, in this case, historians—who came before us. Today, the subtlety of Leo Marx's thesis as well as twentieth-century scholarship on the scientific revolution is too often ignored, if not forgotten, by ecocritics and historical phenomenologists. The early modern (or "pre-Cartesian") period has been characterized most recently as a holistic and monistic golden age, when minds were one with bodies, and bodies were one with the rest of the world. *Engines of the Imagination* is, therefore, a timely intervention in Renaissance studies and an important reminder, for anyone who has grown disenchanted with modern science and technology, not to mistake pre-industrial Europe for a pastoral paradise or a Shakespearean green world.

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 57, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University. ♦

♦ *Res seniles, Libri V-VIII*. By Francesco Petrarca. Edited by Silvia Rizzo, with the collaboration of Monica Berté. Edizione nazionale delle opere di Francesco Petrarca, 2. Florence: Casa Editrice Le Lettere, 2009. 373 pp. 35€. This edition of the letters written by Petrarch in his old age is part of the Edizione nazionale delle opere di Francesco Petrarca. The project began a century ago, with the intention of producing definitive texts of Petrarch's works. Over the first several decades, little progress was made, with Festa's edition of the *Africa* in 1926 being followed by Rossi and Bosco's *Familiars* in 1933-1942, Billanovich's *Rerum memorandarum libri* in 1945, and Martellotti's *De viris illustribus* in 1964. Work was taken up again and reorganized at the end of the twentieth century, in conjunction with the celebration of the seventh centenary of Petrarch's birth in 2004. The reorganized effort has already made considerable progress, with the following volumes currently available:

Contra eum qui maledixit Italie. Ed. by Monica Berté. Florence: Le Lettere, 2005.

Invective contra medicum. Invectiva contra quendam magni status hominem sed nullius scientie aut virtutis. Ed. by Francesco Bausi. Florence: Le Lettere, 2005.

Res Seniles. Libri I-IV. Ed. by Silvia Rizzo, with Monica Berté. Florence: Le Lettere, 2006.

De viris illustribus. Vol. I Ed. by Silvano Ferrone. Florence: Le Lettere, 2006.

De viris illustribus. Vol. II. Ed. by Caterina Malta. Florence: Le Lettere, 2007.

De otio religiosa. Ed. by Giulio Goletti. Florence: Le Lettere, 2006.

Upon completion, CD-ROMs will be produced. The entire project is described at <http://www.franciscus.unifi.it/Commissione/TutoPetrarca.htm>.

The volume under review here is the second installment of the *Seniles*. In line with the series norms, there is no commentary, but there is an apparatus containing authorial variants and some discussion of textual issues along with a second apparatus focused on intertextual references. The Latin text, which is based on the critical edition of E. Nota *et al.* (4 vols., Paris, 2002-2006) but with some variations, is accompanied by a good Italian translation which is useful in clarifying Petrarch's sometimes-puzzling Latin. Any library with a serious interest in Neo-Latin studies should have a standing order for this series, which will be the preferred edition for this vitally important corpus for the foreseeable future. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Bellunesi e feltrini tra Umanesimo e Rinascimento: filologia, erudizione e biblioteche.* Atti del Convegno di Belluno, 4 aprile 2003. Edited by Paolo Pellegrini. Medioevo e Umanesimo, 113. Rome and Padua: Editrice Antenore, 2008. xx + 322 pp. 35€. The eleven essays in this volume of conference proceedings are devoted to Renaissance humanists who had connections to the Italian cities of Belluno and Feltre. An introduction by Rino Avesani lays out the plan of the volume, in which it becomes clear that one group of essays is devoted to Pierio Valeriano, a second to other humanists of lesser importance from Belluno, and a smaller, final group to humanists from nearby Feltre. Kenneth Gouwens opens the volume with a nice paper, "L'Umanesimo al tempo di Pierio Valeriano: la cultura locale, la fama, e la *Respublica litterarum* nella prima metà del Cinquecento," which places Belluno's favorite son, Valeriano, into the broader context of Italian humanism, especially in his relations with Paolo Giovio and Iacopo Sadoletto. In

“Pierio Valeriano’s *De litteratorum infelicitate*: A Literary Work Revised by History,” Julia Haig Gaisser provides a penetrating analysis of the structure of this work, noting that its long view of philosophical and religious truth pulls against the immediate and collective pain of individual suffering wrapped around the key year 1529. Maria Agata Pincelli, in “Un profilo dell’*interpres* nel Rinascimento: l’orazione *in ingressu* di Pierio Valeriano,” reports on Valeriano’s inaugural oration at the *Studium Urbis*, where his discussion of Catullus explored how Quintilian’s concept of the *grammaticus*, master of every field of knowledge, might be applicable in his own day. Marco Perale in turn explores a curious fact in the publication history of Valeriano’s *Hieroglyphica*, that it was first printed in Basel and was not published in Italy until half a century later; the answer given in “1556: Pierio Valeriano, Paolo IV e la doppia edizione degli *Hieroglyphica*” is that a number of people associated with the work had reformist tendencies, leading to an initial publication in a non-Catholic city.

The second group of essays focuses on ‘minor humanists’ from Belluno, individuals who are well worth studying but never attained the stature of Valeriano. Tiziana Pesenti, for example, uses her essay, “Andrea Alpagò: ‘gran traduttore’ di Gerardo da Cremona o nuovo traduttore del *Canone* di Avicenna?,” to evaluate a translation of a key work in the medical canon made by a doctor from Belluno who spent two decades in Damascus. Matteo Venier turns his attention to the *Breves institutiones* of Giovanni Persicini, noting in “La grammatica latina di Giovanni Persicini” that this work deserves more dissemination than it received, given that it imposed a clear order on Latin grammar and illustrated its points with appropriate examples from classical authors. Persicini’s grammar was probably studied by Giangiacomo Sammartini, whose library was discussed by Roberto Spada in “L’«Inventario di libri di messer Zaniacopo Sammartino». Alcune note biografiche su Giovanni Persicini”; F. Malaguzzi’s “Sull’abito di una raccolta bellunese del Cinquecento: la biblioteca Piloni” represents a similar study, this time focused on the books of the counts Piloni, now dispersed but well known to bibliophiles and art historians. In “Pontico Virunio, Guarino e la grammatica greca del Crisolora,” Christian Förstel notes that Pontico, a little-known author today, rewrote the history of Italian humanism, subjecting Byzantine grammar to

a deeper philological criticism from which more modern grammar manuals emerged and attributing to Guarino a number of points which earlier humanist historiography had assigned to Chrysoloras.

The last two essays focus on humanists from Feltre. An especially interesting study is the one presented by Niccolò Zorzi, who rescues the learned Tommaso Zanetelli from oblivion through careful archival work and study of the manuscripts he copied in “Un feltrino nel circolo di Ermolao Barbaro: il notaio Tommaso Zanetelli, alias *Didymus Zenoteles*, copista di codici greci (c. 1450-1514).” Finally Alessandro Scarsella explores the relationship between a humanist from Feltre and the vexed question of the authorship of the *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* in “Giambattista Scita e l'autore dell'*Hypnerotomachia*. lo *status quaestionis*.” Unlike some Italian conference proceedings, this one is nicely furnished with three indices, of names and places, of manuscripts, printed books, and archival documents, and of plates. All in all, this is a most useful volume, offering some fine new work on an important first-rank humanist and some excellent studies of lesser figures associated with him. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *De Troie à Ithaque: Réception des épopées homériques à la Renaissance.* By Philip Ford. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 436. Geneva: Droz, 2007. x + 411 pp. At the end of this rich study, the author poses an interesting question: given that Homer's presence was very strong in France, from the end of the fifteenth to the beginning of the seventeenth centuries, when did it become meaningful to talk about a French Homer? And what characterised the reception of Homer in France compared to that of other European countries? To answer these questions Philip Ford draws on his analyses of Homer's fortune in printed sixteenth-century editions (comprising the original Greek, translations and commentaries) and on the character and fortune of the various translations published in France during the same period, focusing on the political readings of the two poems, not least that of Guillaume Budé, on the role of Jean Dorat and the Pléiade in introducing Homer to a more general public, and on the connection between the humanists' religious beliefs and their exegesis of Homer. The vast number of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century prints on which

the study is based affirms both the breadth and the depth of Homer's influence in Renaissance Europe.

Though the focus of the book is on Renaissance, and especially sixteenth-century, France, Ford synthesizes a much wider material, both geographically and chronologically. He sets out to trace the reception of Homer from the mid-fourteenth century (25 ff.) when, thanks to Petrarch, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* became available to a Latin readership in the translations of Leontius Pilatus, after the events of the Trojan War and of Odysseus' return to Ithaca had been known in Western Europe only in Latin or vernacular reworkings for much of the Middle Ages. In the first part of the book (15-91) he examines publications that somehow concern Homer as a European phenomenon and analyses the various Greek editions, Latin translations, and commentaries produced throughout the Latin West. On the basis of these analyses, he chronicles the first reactions to the Homeric epics and the gradual familiarisation with them that took place, thanks initially to Greek and Italian scholars, and later on to Northern European humanists such as Melanchthon. A central element throughout the chapter is the interpretation of the Homeric poems, which was often influenced by confessional divides.

The second part of the book (91-320) is dedicated to the reception of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in France. Whereas the first part of the book covered the reception of Homer until 1540, the second part studies two periods, the 'Golden Age of Homer' in the years 1541-1570 and the 'twilight of the Homeric gods' in the years 1571-1600. Here Ford discusses the literary reception of Homeric epic in France and examines the way writers and artists had been formed by their education in their views on and use of Homer. Special attention is given to humanists such as Guillaume Budé (167-79) and Jean Dorat (211-28) who inspired successive generations of writers and were deeply influenced by the two Homeric poems. A separate chapter discusses Julius Caesar Scaliger's reshaping of attitudes to Homer (275-311). Of great value and interest is the detailed bibliography of Homeric texts printed before 1600 that completes the study (321-77).

To his question about the character of a French Homer, Ford can conclude that it was a complex phenomenon, reflecting the mentality of the period. The early French students of Greek had been helped

and influenced by Italian and German scholars, but Homer was quickly assimilated into French culture, not least thanks to the two most important Hellenists of the period, Budé and Dorat. Their Homer came to play a central role in sixteenth-century French culture and influenced to a considerable degree our conception of the French Renaissance.

A survey such as the one offered by Ford always runs the risk of becoming a compilation of bibliographical entries. The author has to a large degree avoided that danger by the happy ploy of using two widely studied passages, that of the amorous encounter between Zeus and Hera at Mt. Ida (*Il.* 14.341-56) and that of the Cave of the Nymphs (*Od.* 13.92-112), to describe translations and commentaries. This is just one example of how he manages to organize and present his subject matter to the reader. In spite of the vast material comprised in the study, the present reviewer noticed very few slips or omissions: on p. 1 n. 2 one gets the impression that Lorenzo Valla translated the entire *Iliad* into Latin, when in fact he only translated the first sixteen books, as Ford rightly states on p. 26. Though the Latin translation of Leontius Pilatus is mentioned several times, we hear nothing about his copious annotations of the two poems which were used by Boccaccio, for instance, for his *Genealogie deorum gentilium*, for the *Esposizioni sopra la Comedia* and for the *De montibus*, a dictionary of the names of mountains, rivers, woods, etc. Leontius's annotations have survived in a number of manuscripts and were used by later commentators such as Constantinus Lascaris. In the paragraph on Leontius's translations on p. 25, Ford mentions that the manuscript copies prepared for Petrarch have been preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris. Though he refers to an article of Renata Fabbri for the translations preserved only in manuscript, it might have been relevant at this point to mention that Leontius's translations are actually preserved in a considerable number of manuscripts, the latest of 1527. The book has an index of names; I believe many readers would also have found an *Index locorum* useful.

However, these minor points in no way detract from the very considerable value of the book that will remain the standard study of Homer's reception in the Renaissance France for many years to come. (Marianne Pade, University of Aarhus, Denmark)

◆ *L'Orthographia di Gasparino Barzizza*, vol. 1: *Catalogo dei manoscritti*. By Giliola Barbero. Percorsi dei classici, 12. Messina: Centro Interdipartimentale de Studi Umanistici, 2008. 252 pp. 60€. The book under review here is one of a number of recent publications devoted to Gasparino Barzizza (1360-*ca.* 1430), one of the most important of the early Italian humanist teachers. Director of a series of schools in Pavia, Padua, Ferrara, and Milan, he numbered among his pupils such luminaries as Vittorino da Feltre, Leon Battista Alberti, and Antonio Beccadelli (called 'Il Panormita'). His *Tractatus de compositione* and *Orthographia* were conceived as guidance in how to write a correct, elegant Latin, while his *Epistolae* offered models for how this should be done. Barzizza was well known in his own day—his *Epistolae*, in fact, was the first book to have been printed in France (1470)—but to a certain extent, he has been eclipsed by his students and by other teachers like Guarino da Verona, who have attracted somewhat more scholarly attention in modern times than he has. This, however, is changing. R. G. G. Mercer prepared an extensive study in 1979 (*The Teaching of Gasparino Barzizza, with Special Reference to His Place in Paduan Humanism* (London: Modern Humanities Research Association), while a scholar of the stature of Lucia Gualdo Rosa had recently edited a collection of valuable essays on Barzizza's work (*Gasparino Barzizza e la rinascita degli studi classici: fra continuità e rinnovamento* (Naples: Istituto universitario orientale, 1999)). The book under review here, which began as a thesis for the *dottorato di ricerca* under the indefatigable Vincenzo Fera, marks the latest contribution to this renaissance.

It presents itself as a catalogue of the manuscripts of Barzizza's *Orthographia*, but it is more than that. Barbero provides a detailed codicological description of all sixty-nine extant manuscripts of the work, most of which are datable to the second and third quarter of the fifteenth century and locatable to the Veneto and Lombardy, where Barzizza lived and taught. Most are written not in the prestige humanist bookhand, but in a more rapid hand that combines Gothic with humanistic elements. The catalogue is beautifully done, with each manuscript receiving a full analysis according to modern codicological standards. Barbero's project is designed to provide the foundation on which a critical edition can be erected, but her careful

work suggests that this job will not be easy. Over a hundred years ago, Sabbadini noted that the textual tradition of the *Orthographia* seemed to be confused, and Barbero has confirmed his worst fears, concluding that there are not just two states of the text, as had once been thought, but that the work is found in a number of different redactions, some of which probably record authorial revisions but others of which do not. Barzizza's approach to orthography, in which he focused on spelling changes as a word evolved from Latin to the vernacular, invited revision as knowledge about historical linguistics grew, and the manuscript tradition confirms that these revisions took place regularly, as first Barzizza, then his readers emended their texts to take new information into account.

This book appears in a series published through the Interdepartmental Center for Humanistic Studies at the University of Messina, a series that includes *inter alia* the proceedings of two well-known conferences, one on marginalia held in 1998 and the other on the classics and the humanist university held in 2001, along with other works on humanist grammar and rhetoric. This series in turn is one of six sponsored by the Center, which also publishes a journal of interest to readers of NLN, *Studi medievali e umanistici*. Further information is available at their website: <http://ww2.unime.it/cisu/>. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Building the Kingdom: Giannozzo Manetti on the Material and Spiritual Edifice*. Edited by Christine Smith and Joseph F. O'Connor. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 317; Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, 20. Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2007. xviii + 518 pp. \$69. In *Building the Kingdom*, two accomplished scholars examine Giannozzo Manetti's *De secularibus et pontificalibus pompis* (a description of the consecration of Florence Cathedral in 1436) and book two of Manetti's *Life of Nicholas V*. They have prepared a critical edition and translation whose insightful commentary and attentive annotation offer an exceptionally complete view of the texts within their cultural and historical contexts. Christine Smith brought to the project a capacity for marrying the close study of Renaissance architectural theory with the creative analysis of both buildings and cities, already evidenced in

her important and provocative book, *Architecture in the Culture of Early Humanism: Ethics, Aesthetics, and Eloquence: 1400-1479* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992). Joseph F. O'Connor, a scholar of Greek and Latin literature, contributes a philologist's intimate knowledge of language, adding a subtlety to the reading that only a deep understanding of classical sources, Renaissance humanism and Manetti's biography and *oeuvre* can produce. The resulting book makes a unique contribution to both architectural history and intellectual history.

The Renaissance saw the publication of several architectural treatises that aimed to codify architectural decorum. Manetti's texts offer a rare view of how a non-architect perceived Renaissance architecture and urbanism in relation to patrons and functions, but also in relation to his own, idiosyncratic interests. Consequently, ekphrasis and critique are not instrumentalized; rather, they are contextualized in such a way that they address political and intellectual ends outside of architecture.

Manetti's description of the Florence cathedral consecration is based on his firsthand knowledge of the event, which took place on March 25, 1436. He wrote it at the request of Agnolo Acciaiuoli, Manetti's brother-in-law and himself a learned Florentine who had also attended the celebration. From an architectural perspective, *De pompis* does not reveal much about the building that the reader does not already know. Manetti praises the form, scale and material of the *duomo*, preferring to comment upon rational and empirical qualities like measurements rather than to delve into a more abstract aesthetic critique. Manetti sees in the building an anthropomorphic order and thereby reiterates one of the most common tropes of his day in relation to religious architecture (discussed in detail in Chapters 2 and 9). The theme, which, Smith and O'Connor convincingly argue, is both formal and literary, reappeared later in Manetti's *Life of Nicholas V*. The emphasis, however, is not on the architecture, which is treated almost as a stage set, but rather on the spectacle—the ritual's ephemeral aspects, such as the liturgy and the music. The translation, critical commentary and analysis of *De pompis* builds for the reader a framework for understanding Manetti's rhetorical approach, as well as the literary sources and political priorities that informed his views.

The book's focus is Manetti's chapter on Pope Nicholas V's achievements. A scholar of Hebrew, Greek and Latin, Manetti was

at the center of a Florentine intellectual circle during Pope Eugenius IV's stay in the city, when he came to the attention of Tommaso Parentucelli, the future Pope Nicholas V, Eugenius's successor. In 1451, Nicholas appointed Manetti to the position of papal secretary; Manetti lived in Rome from 1453 to 1455, the last two years of his patron's pontificate. The *Life*, written after the pontiff's death, is Manetti's effort to defend Nicholas's ambitious building campaigns in relation to desires to represent the Church Triumphant through architecture and urban projects. The reader comes to understand how a humanist with little interest in architecture experienced and perceived his built surroundings, and this in itself makes the text a valuable source. But architectural historians will be especially interested in Smith and O'Connor's excursus of Manetti's particular usage of architectural terminology (Chapter 5). An example is his use of the word 'area' for an urban space that is smaller than what is typically referred to as a 'piazza.' Here, space is not objectified, nor is it simply the by-product of surrounding buildings. Manetti's understanding of space is placed in precise relationship to his understanding of other conditions, like 'place,' 'perspective,' and 'figure,' all of which affect one another in the built realm. As such, space is not a void, but the result of an accumulative circumstance, perceptible and knowable but not defined in the way that solid objects are. This discussion of nuanced ways of understanding space is instructive to today's architects, historians, and theorists, who too often bandy about the term 'space' in an imprecise and unself-conscious manner, in reference to voids of varied and often-amorphous characteristics.

This book's great contribution is its engagement with the intersection of humanist culture and the built environment of fifteenth-century Italy, particularly Rome. It offers new perspectives on Nicholas V's building campaigns, the most ambitious of any Quattrocento pope. In this, it complements the studies of Carroll William Westfall (*In This Most Perfect Paradise: Alberti, Nicholas V, and the Invention of Conscious Urban Planning in Rome, 1447-55* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1974)) and Charles Burroughs (*From Signs to Design: Environmental Process and Reform in Renaissance Rome* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990)), both of whom used very different historiographical and theoretical approaches to analyze some of the same

monuments. The book will be an outstanding resource for specialists, particularly scholars of Renaissance architecture. Although the careful reader appreciates having these two Manetti texts in the same volume, the *Life of Nicholas V* could probably have stood alone. The lack of an index frustrates the reader's efforts to focus consistently on particular themes that recur throughout the book, but it seems churlish to complain of it, given the depth and breadth the authors bring to the project, evidenced not only in the text, but also in the ample and helpful notes. (Saundra Weddle, Drury University)

◆ *Il problema del libero arbitrio nel pensiero di Pietro Pomponazzi: la dottrina etica del De fato: spunti di critica filosofica e teologica nel Cinquecento.* By Rita Ramberti. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2007. xxiii + 325 pp. In this work Rita Ramberti attempts to make sense of the *De fato*, a complex work of the famed Renaissance Italian Aristotelian, Pietro Pomponazzi (1462-1525), who held major professorships in philosophy, first at Padua and then at Bologna. While scholars have long debated Pomponazzi's corpus, not until recently has *De fato* been the subject of intense scrutiny and discussion. Ramberti's book adds not only to the understanding of Pomponazzi's text, but also of its influence in the first half of the Cinquecento.

Ramberti begins by discussing Pomponazzi scholarship and providing a sketch of previous Renaissance texts on free will and several of his earlier works, in which the influences of Aristotelianism and Stoicism are evident. Central to Pomponazzi's thought is the paradox of asserting both human free will and a natural world governed by eternal laws. While in earlier texts Pomponazzi argued that the immortality of the soul cannot be determined rationally and that events which appeared to be miracles or divine intervention were truly caused by nature (and in a world governed by immutable laws no human liberty is possible), in *De fato* he fully embraces Christianity, with the purpose of locating human free will within Christian theology. This, too, is problematic, since God's foreknowledge—part of divine omnipotence—removes human free will. In order to extricate himself from this problem, Ramberti argues that Pomponazzi sets forth a theoretical innovation: God's self-limitation. Pomponazzi proclaims that God limits his foreknowledge so that his divine decrees

correspond with the exact moment when human will is exercised. Divine self-limitation, therefore, allows for the existence of human free will. With *De fato* Pomponazzi has placed human freedom within the Christian tradition, and faith has become rationally defensible.

Further, Ramberti also references the exercise of human free will and its goal of attaining virtue by overcoming the human disposition. Human virtue can be realized if man willingly forms and maintains the social body. Man collectively seeks the common good, which is the ultimate end. The virtuous and moral life is distinctively human, and the exercise of such a life leads to happiness in the human world, which is perfectible according to the rules God has given.

The third and final chapter of Ramberti's work is perhaps the most interesting. In it, Ramberti examines reactions to and the influence of Pomponazzi's work. Supporters defended his claims of orthodoxy, while detractors labeled him a heretic and ally of Luther. In the period in question—from the 1520's to the actual publication of *De fato* in 1567 (forty-seven years after its composition)—Ramberti's most engaging discussion, among several, is that of Pomponazzi's work in the anti-Luther and anti-Erasmus polemic. Employing the examples of Celio Calcagnini, Juan Gines de Sepulveda, and Ambrogio Fiandino, Ramberti fascinatingly describes how *De fato* is absorbed by both sides in the battle over free will. The treatment of fate and free will in the natural philosophy of Girolamo Cardano and Simone Porzio is also worth a careful reading.

Ramberti's work is a fine example of scholarship, well-researched and well-argued. It is the most comprehensive discussion of *De fato* to date. While one may cite minor squabbles with the text, such as whether Pomponazzi can be depicted as a wholly obedient Christian, the book is a welcome addition to Pomponazzi studies as well as philosophical and theological thought in the Cinquecento. (Jeffrey A. Glodzik, State University of New York at Fredonia)

◆ *Paraphrase on Matthew*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Edited by Robert Sider. Translated and Annotated by Dean Simpson. Collected Works of Erasmus, 45. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2008. xvi + 449 pp. It is hard to believe that the Collected Works of Erasmus series is more than half finished—the

book under review here is the fifty-second of the ninety projected volumes. Indeed, it is now hard to imagine Erasmus studies without the CWE. The *Paraphrase on Matthew* is simply the latest entry in this indispensable enterprise.

Erasmus wrote his paraphrase on Matthew after he had finished paraphrasing the epistles. He first declined the request to undertake the project, then changed his mind and, he says, finished it in only a month, having it published a few months later by Froben, then three more times in his lifetime. The finished project shows that his initial doubts were not well founded, for the Gospel text benefits in some ways from Erasmus's character exposition, insinuation of motive, and externalization of psychological forces, along with the ways in which he makes the action vivid. Several themes run through the paraphrase. First is the representation of Jesus as a master teacher: he adapts himself to the developing abilities of his students, the disciples, quizzing them and rebuking them as appropriate. Second, we see Erasmus's profound concern for the religious welfare of society and the individual. And finally, we see a focus on the Gospel as an alternative to the threats posed by Satan and the corrupt religious establishment. Access to these key themes is enhanced by carefully constructed annotation. Here we see changes that occur through the publishing history of the book, along with notes on sources, especially parallel passages from the other Gospels and the key patristic sources: Origen, the *Homilies on Matthew* by Chrysostom, and the *Commentary on Matthew* by Jerome. Finally, the notes position the *Paraphrase on Matthew* within the controversies its publication aroused. The book was attacked by Noël Bédæ, then defended in Erasmus's *Elenchus, Divinationes ad notata Bedæ*, and *Supputatio calumniarum Natalis Bedæ*, ultimately to no avail, since the Faculty of Theology in Paris condemned the *Paraphrases* in 1527. Erasmus responded with his *Declarationes ad censuras Lutetiae vulgatas*, but the work was attacked again at a meeting of Spanish monks, to whom Erasmus wrote his *Apologia adversus monachos*. The notes give an indication of what was at stake in these controversies.

The *Paraphrase on Matthew* was Erasmus's first chance to set out a full portrait of the life of Jesus as he understood it. As such, it merits a read by anyone interested in the theological aspects of Neo-Latin studies. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Beatus Rhenanus. Rerum Germanicarum libri tres*. Edited by Felix Mundt. Frühe Neuzeit, 127. Tübingen: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. XIV + 674 pp. 147.66€. Mundt (hereafter M.) provides us here with an excellent and much-needed new edition of this very important work of Beatus Rhenanus. M.'s book will certainly foster and enhance further research not only about Beatus Rhenanus's life and works, but also in this particularly interesting field at the crossroads between geographical and historical studies in early modern times.

As regards the table of contents of this book, which is the revised version of M.'s 2007 dissertation, the editor's report on his edition of Beatus Rhenanus's three books on German affairs (1-9) is followed by a Latin edition and German translation of Sturm's life of Beatus Rhenanus (12-27), Sapidus's encomium for Beatus Rhenanus (26 f.), and Beatus Rhenanus's dedicatory letter to king Ferdinand (28-33), as well as Beatus Rhenanus's three books themselves (34-421). Interpretive studies on Beatus Rhenanus and his work make up the next section on pages 425-615. A bibliography (617-38) and four indices (641-74: index of names of persons, index of names of places and peoples, index of *verba notabilia vel a Rhenano explicata*, and *index locorum*) conclude M.'s book.

M. bases his edition on the 1551 printing of the work and diligently explains the value of the other four editions of the *Rerum Germanicarum libri tres* (1531, 1610, 1670, and 1693) for his new edition. A. F. W. Sommer (Vienna: Im Selbstverlag, 2006) just published a reprint of the 1531 edition. This reprint, however, in turn demonstrates the need for M.'s scientific edition. Needless to say, also nowadays the internet provides us with an enormous number of digital versions of old (and new) books that increases on a daily basis. Rhenanus's books are among them. But this fact actually increases further the necessity of thorough philological work. And M.'s edition is a very good example of what this kind of work can mean for future research on authors from the Renaissance period.

M.'s translation is true to the original text and reads very well at the same time. As is the case with every translation, of course, there are certain stylistic questions—for example in regard to word order or similar issues—that might have been answered differently

by a different translator. But I did not observe anything that would detract from the value of M.'s translation. The only general question I would like to point our attention to is whether one needs to treat the occasional Greek passages in Rhenanus's text differently from the Latin, i.e., whether we should translate these Greek passages into, e.g., English or French. This kind of procedure would make it clear to the reader that what he reads is in fact a Latin translation derived from a text rendered in a different language. The fact that Rhenanus himself found it necessary to quote these texts in their original Greek and then translated these passages into Latin would lend itself to a very interesting further study on Rhenanus's language skills. Maybe we could even find out something about Rhenanus's use of translations. *Mutatis mutandis*, the same is true, of course, in regard to other languages or texts from earlier periods of the German language that found their way into Rhenanus's work.

M.'s studies on Rhenanus's work are groundbreaking in the truest sense of the word, because, as M. himself concedes (426), these studies are just one step towards a detailed line-by-line commentary on the *Rerum Germanicarum libri*. There is a great need for much more research in this field, before anyone could dare to tackle this Herculean labor of analyzing in minute detail Rhenanus's sources, aims, and influence. Having said that, we need to thank M. for the vast amount of work and analysis which he provides us here. M.'s studies and remarks deal with more general questions about Beatus Rhenanus's life and the context and influence of the *Rerum Germanicarum libri* first. He then follows the structure of the edition and does a marvelous job of placing a wealth of information at the reader's disposal without ever losing sight of the reader's needs in terms of brevity, clarity, and perspicuity. Undoubtedly, M.'s work will serve as a solid and firm foundation for much interesting research to come.

In addition, M. nicely demonstrates just how many more challenges are waiting for researchers in the field of Neo-Latin studies. For example, there are some authors among Beatus Rhenanus's sources that are read less often today and mostly known to specialists in their fields only. In the Renaissance there was in fact a market for these works, and the shape of this market was still developing as Gerstenberg, for example, has pointed out (see A. Gerstenberg,

Thomaso Porcacchis L'Isole piu famose del mondo. Zur Text- und Wortgeschichte der Geographie im Cinquecento (mit Teiledition) Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, 326 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 2004), pp. 2 f. and 263). And this market was not restricted to Latin, but expanded rapidly into the vernacular languages. The genres, modes of discourse, and textual structures for certain branches of scientific knowledge were diversified. M.'s study will help us to determine more exactly the shape, size, and conditions of this developing market for publications because Rhenanus's choices indicate the kind of audience he was targeting. Also Rhenanus himself, of course, needs to be seen as a part of this audience. In this regard, M.'s analysis of efforts by other Renaissance authors to produce literature of roughly the same kind as Rhenanus (490-532) is also highly relevant here.

In general, M. is clearly right in declaring that a serious look at Rhenanus's studies will make even more obvious how interconnected different periods of time are in regard to their knowledge (426 f.), even if this knowledge should be specialist knowledge. M.'s book enables us to study further Beatus Rhenanus's role within the context of the development of these branches of science like geography or historiography. Thanks to M., we can and must do this now on a more informed basis than before. (Wolfgang Polleicher, Ruhr-Universität Bochum)

◆ *Der Jedermann im 16. Jahrhundert. Die Hecastus-Dramen von Georgius Macropedius und Hans Sachs.* By Raphael Dammer and Benedikt Jeßing. Quellen und Forschungen zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte, 42 (276). Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2007. 321 pp. 98€ / \$137. The tradition of the Everyman in literature, dating from the late Middle Ages up to Philip Roth's 2006 novel, is an important theme that has lost neither its impact nor its fascination. Its roots are the well-known English moral play *Everyman* (late fifteenth century) and the equivalent Dutch *Elckerlijc* (ca. 1475), whose interdependence still remains to be clarified. In sixteenth-century Germany, Georgius Macropedius's Latin rendering of the material, *Hecastus* (1539), provided the basis for Hans Sachs's adaptation in early modern German, the *Comedi von dem reichen sterbenden menschen / Der Hecastus genannt* (1549). Both works fall within the period of the Reformation movement and

present us with the interesting situation that Macropedius (1487-1558, from s'Hertogenbosch in Brabant) happened to belong to a Catholic fraternity, whereas Sachs (1449-1576, from Nuremberg) was an enthusiastic spokesman for Protestantism. Thus, to compare Macropedius and Sachs in one edition is a great idea of enormous benefit for both scholars and students.

Dammer and Jeßing's introduction (1-29) offers a concise and comprehensive overview that provides the reader with the literary background of the *Everyman*, the context and development of Reformation drama as well as the authors' biographies, literary activities, and religious orientation. The influences of English and French moral plays from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, Prudentius's *Pyschomachia* (ca. 400), and the Latin context of Plautinian and Terentian *palliata* are traced and evaluated, which culminated in their instrumental use within the religious debates during and after the Reformation. After Macropedius's drama had been published, he was heavily criticised and accused of propagating Protestant heresy, so that he had to rework his text and stress the Catholic view: in case of *sudden* death, he argues, not only good deeds, but faith alone can save one's soul, too. Yet, as Dammer and Jeßing stress, the theological ambivalence persists in the revised version (cf. p. 29), which probably appealed to Sachs when he decided to translate the play into German.

The main part of the book contains the edition of the two plays (31-315). Since both earlier editions (Macropedius by Bolte 1927, Sachs by Keller and Goetze 1870-1908) are problematic and in terms of textual criticism of little use (cf. p. 31), the presentation of Macropedius's Latin text next to Sachs's German rendering presents us with an excellent new edition of high scholarly value, allowing for the indispensable comparison of the two plays. Macropedius's first version is followed by an appendix of his later interpolations and changes (184-93), which makes it easy to compare the two. The translation of the Latin (194-263) is especially useful for non-Latinists and makes the edition attractive for scholars and students of (Early High) German, too. Apart from its practical use, it is a joy to read: the two authors indeed follow their principle of translating as close to the original as possible, yet as freely as necessary (cf. p. 33), whereby the chorus is retained in poetry and thus gives an impression of how

the original might have worked. The commentary, which rounds off the edition (264–315), is not too capacious, yet comprehensive and a useful accompaniment to the texts: individuals, names, allusions, and words are explained, as are grammatical issues, metre and melody, or strange expressions. Maybe an *apparatus fontium* would also have been helpful as regards sources and allusions to (Latin) passages or biblical quotations, but this is obviously a difficult undertaking, which the authors decided against (cf. p. 26). It is very beneficial that Dammer and Jeßing generally note divergences and differences from Macropeidius in the commentary on Sachs, thereby providing the first steps in the direction of further comparative studies. Finally, a list of helpful resources, a bibliography of secondary literature, and a register facilitate the use of the book.

All in all, the two plays speak for themselves as an impressive example of how Neo-Latin and the vernacular, humanist and popular ideals, and Catholicism and Reformation interacted and were indebted to each other in the sixteenth century. This is a perfect basis for scholars of both Neo-Latin and German to explore further a fascinating genre and its interrelated history. (Eva von Contzen, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany)

◆ *Obras Completas III: Académica*. By Pedro de Valencia. Edited, translated, and annotated by Juan Francisco Domínguez Domínguez. León: Universidad de León, 2006. *Obras Completas X: Traducciones*. By Pedro de Valencia. Coordinated by Jesús M^a Nieto Ibáñez. León: Universidad de León, Instituto de humanismo y tradición clásica, 2008. Pedro de Valencia (1555-1620), theologian and classical scholar, whose papers were confiscated by the Inquisition in 1618, developed a close friendship with Arias Montano, with whom he collaborated *inter alia* in the cataloguing of the library of the Escorial. *Obras* Volume III includes a preliminary study, bibliography, and extensive discussion of the textual tradition with twenty title-page photos. The bilingual (Latin / Spanish) text includes studies dealing with Arcesilas, Pyrrho, Stoicism, Carneades and the New Academy, the Cyrenaics, and Epicurus. *Obras* Volume X contains Latin translations of Theophrastus's *De igne*, part of Thucydides Book 1, and Saint Epiphanius of Cyprus's *De lapidibus*. Translations into Spanish include Dio of Prusa, *On Retirement*;

Lysias's oration *On the Death of Eratosthenes*; a discourse of Epictetus on those who seek a life of quiet; and a fourteen-page "Discourse on the Matter of War and the State, Composed of Sentiments and Words (*sentencias y palabras*) from Demosthenes." (Edward V. George, Texas Tech University (Emeritus))

◆ *The Early Latin Poetry of Sylvester Phrygius*. Edited, with introduction, translation and commentary by Peter Sjökvist. *Studia Latina Upsaliensia*, 31. Uppsala: Uppsala University Library, 2007. 408 pp. Since the publication of Hans Helander's editions of Emanuel Swedenborg's texts (1985, 1988, 1995), the series *Studia Latina Upsaliensia* has presented several editions of Swedish Neo-Latin literature, many of them being doctoral theses. Peter Sjökvist's solid work on the early poetry of the theologian Sylvester Johannes Phrygius (1572-1628) is a welcome addition to the series. Phrygius is considered one of the foremost representatives of early Swedish Neo-Latin poetry; his texts have drawn some scholarly attention, but the present work is the first large-scale study on him. It focuses on three major portions of Phrygius's early Latin poetry, which were probably written between the years 1597-1602, when he was mostly studying at several universities in Northern Germany (Rostock, Hannover, Jena, Wittenberg). With these poems Phrygius became one of those who introduced the literary fashions of continental humanism to Sweden. The significance of the German impact on Swedish Neo-Latin literature can hardly be underestimated: several generations of Swedish authors, Phrygius included, were educated in German universities, and their works were anchored in German academic literary culture. After the Lutheran Reformation had been carried out in Sweden in the 1520s and 1530s, education at the University of Uppsala (founded in 1477) was largely suspended for several decades, and students had to leave for abroad to pursue academic studies, Protestant German universities ranking as the most popular destination. These same German universities were also frequented by Swedish students after the reopening of the University of Uppsala in 1593.

The three poems chosen for this edition, *Ecloga prima*, *Threnologia dramatica* (a poem from the *Agon Regius* print) and *Centuria prima*, represent different literary genres. However, the author states in the in-

roduction of the work that they constitute their own easily discernible group in Phrygius's literary production, which is in its entirety listed and categorized at the end of the work. Although the author does not *expressis verbis* explain in what way the poems form a group of their own, he presumably refers not only to the date of their composition but also and quite specifically to the political and social contexts of these poems that interestingly mirror the vicissitudes of this turbulent period in Swedish history. Historical background is indeed essential for the understanding of the present poems and their function. The writer manages to give a survey that is to the point but does not oversimplify the complex situation. The period from the death of King Gustavus Vasa in 1560 until Charles IX was crowned the King of Sweden in 1607 was marked by confusion about the succession to the throne, by strained relations with Poland as well as by tensions between the Catholic Counter-Reformation and Lutheranism and between the king and the nobility. A young man and writer in search of a respectable career and powerful patrons had to explore his opportunities in largely unpredictable circumstances. As for Phrygius, he counted on Duke John, son of John III (1568-1592), for his rise to power, but, to Phrygius's disappointment, the Duke renounced all claims to power in 1604 in favour of his uncle (Charles IX).

When defining his methodological approach, the writer brings forward many important aspects which concern Neo-Latin poetry in general. A special emphasis is put on the importance of the synchronic perspective in interpreting Neo-Latin texts. The recent emergence of databases of Neo-Latin literature provides a useful tool for this kind of research. The author has particularly availed himself of the database *Camena—Corpus Automatum Multiplex Electorum Neolatinitatis Auctorum*, which contains poetry composed in Germany in the sixteenth century. In regard to Swedish Neo-Latin poetry prior to Phrygius, the writer has been able to read it all through due to the relatively small number of relevant works, such as those by Henricus Mollerus, Laurentius Petri Gothus, and Ericus Jacobi Skinnerus. This of course offers an excellent opportunity to examine the initial history of Neo-Latin poetry in Sweden as a whole.

The date of composition, the literary genre, and the contemporary circumstances of the poems are discussed in the chapter which serves

as an introduction to the poems; in the commentary section, the writer gets back to several questions with further details. *Ecloga prima*, printed in 1599 in Hamburg, was written on the death of Birgitta, daughter to Bishop Petrus Benedicti, Phrygius's patron and future father-in-law. Because he is not known to have published other eclogues, the title of the poem invites a question why Phrygius used the word '*prima*.' The poem contains pastoral elements, and its indebtedness to Virgil's first eclogue might have been one of the reasons to entitle it as "the first eclogue." It is also suggested that Phrygius intended to point out that it was the first time that the eclogue genre was used in Swedish literature, and this is true. The poem consists of a dialogue between two interlocutors whose names are not Greek, as they usually were in pastorals, nor do they appear in Latinized form. The original Swedish names (Ebbe and Tore) and the completely Swedish setting of the poem can be seen as Phrygius's desire to adapt the eclogue to Swedish conditions. Moreover, the poem combines autobiographical features (one of the interlocutors can be identified as Phrygius himself) with the conventional topics of funeral poems.

Threnologia dramatica is a funeral poem, or a lament, in honour of King John III of Sweden, who died in 1592. Phrygius wrote the poem almost ten years after the King's death, and it was not published until 1620, in the *Agon Regius* print. The poem is divided into four dramas (or acts). In the first drama, the author converses with Pallas; this is obviously influenced by Georg Sabinus's poem *Ad Ioannem Bogum, Regis Poloniae anlicum. Elegia XII* (1568?). Duke John, who was the closest legitimate heir to the throne at the time of the composition of the poem, is the principal character and besides the author, the only real character in the drama, if we disregard his late parents, who appear briefly. Since Duke John died in 1618, before the printing of the poem, Phrygius inserted into the drama a brief dialogue between the late queen and king, lamenting in heaven over their son's untimely death. The adjective 'dramatic' in the title primarily refers to the dialogue form, which we met already in Phrygius's *Ecloga prima* and which was popular in contemporary funeral and wedding poetry in general. These texts were not intended to be staged, but if they were ever publicly read or recited aloud, they were naturally only a step away from a dramatic performance.

Centuria prima, printed in 1602 in Rostock and dedicated to a young Swedish nobleman, consists of 100 (in fact, of 99) captioned hortatory and admonishing distichs, which were supposed to form the first part of a larger work. The writer suggests that Phrygius would initially have planned to dedicate it to Duke John, hoping to be able to publish emblems proper by adorning the distichs with pictures using the Duke's financial support. When it became obvious to everyone that Duke John would not ascend the throne, the dedicatee would have had to be changed and *Centuria prima* became a simple print of 'bare emblems' (*emblemata nuda*), with headings (*inscriptio*) and distichs (*subscriptio*) but without pictures. The writer justifies this interpretation by the content of the emblems as well as by some issues external to the text. Various aspects of governing are dealt with in many emblems or paraenetic distichs, as Phrygius calls them, but the writer rightly notes that advice to rulers constituted the essence of many emblematic collections, which were inspired by mirrors of princes. The majority of the emblems are not arranged in any systematic way; only 'precautionary' emblems (distichs number 83-90) seem to form an entity.

The texts are largely edited according to the principles that have been established earlier in the series, basically meaning that the original form of the text has been kept as far as it does not confuse the understanding; that is why punctuation has been altered to conform to modern standards. The commentary aims at establishing Phrygius's literary models and sources by finding and identifying allusions and intertexts as well as relevant thematic and linguistic parallels and echoes from ancient and Neo-Latin literature. The commentary is very detailed and meticulously documented throughout. Several times the writer is able to revise ideas stated in earlier research and offer fresh and convincing interpretations concerning, for example, such things as Phrygius's relationship with the royal family, dating, and dedicatory questions regarding the poems. The comprehensive analysis involves consistently taking the political, religious, and social contexts into consideration, which often opens intriguing aspects of the poems. One of the most interesting features in the poems examined is Phrygius's self-expression, not only in respect to his career-building but also in respect to the history of Swedish literature. Phrygius wrote for himself a part in *Ecloga prima* and *Threnologia dramatica*, complain-

ing of the absence of Swedish literary models and pitying himself, as he felt that he was not appreciated in accordance with his merits.

Although the main arguments and points are well emphasized and repeatedly brought up in the introduction and commentary, it is a pity that the work does not include a conclusion. Owing to the great number of details and the vast reference material presented, a reader would have appreciated hearing in what way the writer thinks Phrygius's literary models and sources profited him as a writer. Since Phrygius has a special position in the history of Swedish Neo-Latin literature, it would also have been particularly interesting to learn something about his possible impact on future writers. (Raija Sarasti-Wilenius, University of Helsinki)

◆ *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Emidio Campi, Simone De Angelis, Anja-Silvia Goeing, and Anthony T. Grafton. *Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, 447. Geneva: Droz, 2008. The papers in this volume were collected from a conference held in Zurich at the end of 2005, whose goal was to "to gather experts from all disciplines to discuss European Renaissance textbooks used in academia, their content and their making" (9). The obvious paradigm for a paper at this conference was to select one or two textbooks and to focus on them, working back to classroom practice and out to larger issues and concerns. This is what most of the participants did. In "Melanchthon's Textbooks of Dialectic and Rhetoric as Complementary Parts of a Theory of Argumentation," for example, Volkhard Wels contrasts the simplified, practice-oriented approach to argumentation in Melanchthon to the medieval textbooks whose goal was a full exploration of the subtleties of the subject. Daniel Tröhler uses "The Knowledge of Science and the Knowledge of the Classroom: Using the Heidelberg Catechism (1563) to Examine Overlooked Connections" to explore how the catechism can teach basic information with clarity, while Barbara Mahlmann-Bauer in turn shows in "Catholic and Protestant Textbooks in Elementary Latin Conversation: Manuals of Religious Combat or Guide to Avoiding Conflict?" that Latin dialogues could teach both conversational skills and a measure of tolerance through the development of varying positions. Emidio Campi discusses Peter Martyr's classroom practice as

exegete and theologian in “Peter Martyr Vermigli as a Teacher at the Schola Tigurina.” In “Heinrich Bullinger (1504–1575) and the Ancient Languages” Peter Stotz shows how humanist textbooks could offer not only linguistic skills but also a hermeneutic for unpacking texts. Anja-Silvia Goeing returns to language teaching in “Establishing Modes of Learning: Old and New Hebrew Grammars in the Sixteenth Century,” arguing that Theodor Bibliander’s new comparative approach to grammar teaching exemplifies a new system of knowledge that arose from the classroom. By contrast, in “Teaching Physics in Louvain and Bologna: Frans Titelmans and Ulisse Aldrovandi,” David A. Lines shows that the kinds of physics textbooks used in the Renaissance classroom suggest that teachers were looking not for new perspectives or discoveries, but for an established body of knowledge in a comprehensible form. In “Teaching Stoic Moral Philosophy: Kaspar Schoppe’s *Elementa philosophiae Stoicae moralis* (1606),” Jill Kraye suggests similarly that Schoppe’s work fails (especially in comparison to Lipsius) if judged as original scholarship, but succeeds quite well as a call for pedagogical reform, providing the orderly, methodical summary of Stoicism required for that purpose. Simone De Angelis lays out the twists and turns on the pedagogical road in “From Text to the Body: Commentaries on *De anima*, Anatomical Practice and Authority around 1600,” demonstrating that the commentary tradition on this one key Aristotelian text sometimes stimulated new discoveries like William Harvey’s observation that blood circulated, while at the same time guiding Johannes Kepler to abandon the text entirely and turn his optical research elsewhere. Nancy G. Siraisi captures nicely in “Medicina Practica: Girolamo Mercuriale as Teacher and Textbook Author” the irony of what happens when published lecture notes convey what went on in the author’s classroom but never in turn get assigned as a textbook by anyone else, while in “Jakob Ruf’s *Trostbüchlein* and *De conceptu* (Zurich 1554): A Textbook for Midwives and Physicians,” Hildegard Elisabeth Keller and Hubert Steinke show that textbooks can function outside the male clerical environment of the Renaissance university.

Each of the papers mentioned thus far provides something of interest and value. As Urs B. Leu notes in “Textbooks and Their Uses—An Insight into the Teaching of Geography in Sixteenth-

Century Zurich,” however, information about teaching can also be derived from student sources, and in the handful of papers from this conference that take this approach, things get really interesting. The richest contribution is Ann Blair’s “Student Manuscripts and the Textbook,” which provides the clearest account I have ever seen of how students prepared their own textbooks by taking down the lectures of their masters. Dictation, it seems, was more common than we might have imagined, surviving as marginal notes in printed texts or as free-standing manuscripts. *Reportationes* were sometimes prepared by teams and were often revised from the messy scribbles made in class to fair copies. Anyone who has followed the early printed history of classical authors has noticed the small fascicles obviously set up for student note-taking that were published in several German and Dutch cities between ca. 1490 and 1520; Jürgen Leonhardt presents some preliminary finds from a large research project devoted to these books in “Classics as Textbooks: A Study of the Humanist Lectures on Cicero at the University of Leipzig, ca. 1515.” The books themselves allow us to trace the fitful progress of humanism in the Renaissance university, while the handwritten lecture notes they contain add the work of teachers who published little to the picture we have of Renaissance scholarship that is based in printed books. A book in press at the moment, *The Classics in the Medieval and Renaissance Classroom*, ed. J. F. Ruys, J. Ward, and M. Heyworth (Turnhout, Brepols), will pursue some of these points further.

In a stimulating introduction, “Textbooks and the Disciplines,” Anthony T. Grafton suggests how problematic the study of Renaissance textbooks can become. For one thing it is difficult to say for sure what a textbook is: many works that were never written as textbooks, like Castiglione’s *Il cortegiano*, were used in that way, while other books whose titles clearly suggest that they were written as textbooks were never, so far as we know, adopted in any class. Erasmus in turn insisted upon wide reading in the classics, then produced books like *De copia* and the *Adages* that eliminated the need for precisely this sort of pedagogical breadth. Jürgen Oeklers’s afterward, “Elementary Textbooks in the Eighteenth Century and Their Theory of the Learning Child,” is equally provocative, focusing on a problem that is so obvious that it is often overlooked: what is the concept of childhood that governs

the production of a given textbook? In the end, then, this essay collection does what any such volume ought to do: it answers some questions that are worth asking, and leaves the reader with others to pursue. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Lives of the Popes*, vol. 1: *Antiquity*. By Bartolomeo Platina. Ed. and trans. by Anthony F. D'Elia. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 30. xxxii + 328 pp. *Essays and Dialogues*. By Bartolomeo Scala. Trans. by Renée Neu Watkins. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 31. xviii + 314 pp. *History of Venice*, vol. 2: *Books V-VIII*. By Pietro Bembo. Ed. and trans. by Robert W. Ulery, Jr. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 32. xii + 407 pp. *Writings on Church and Reform*. By Nicholas of Cusa. Trans. by Thomas B. Izbicki. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 33. xx + 663 pp. *Commentaries on Plato*, vol. 1: *Phaedrus and Ion*. By Marsilio Ficino. Ed. and trans. by Michael J. B. Allen. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 34. lx + 269 pp. *Poems*. By Cristoforo Landino. Trans. by Mary P. Chatfield. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 35. xxvi + 398 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2008. \$29.95 each. Those who have followed the fortunes of The I Tatti Renaissance Library since its relatively recent inception have noticed by now that the pace of publication has picked up: the 2008 harvest, under review here, totals six volumes. Somewhat arbitrarily, perhaps, these six books can be divided into two very different projects: three that are part of multi-volume presentations of long works, and three that serve as collections of smaller works into composite volumes.

Of the first group, Robert W. Ulery's volume is the second of three that cover the history of Venice from 1487 to 1513. An official history of the city, the *History of Venice* covers both internal politics and external affairs, especially conflicts with the other European states and with the Turks in the East. The author, Pietro Bembo (1470-1547), a Venetian nobleman and cardinal, was a celebrated stylist in Latin and Italian (versions of the history exist in both languages), fostering Ciceronianism in the former and the Tuscan dialect in the latter. The current volume covers the years 1499 to 1509. The other two volumes in this group initiate the series of which they are a part. Bartolomeo Platina (1421-1481), the author of the *Lives of the Popes*,

lived a life that took an unusual number of unexpected turns, including a stint as a mercenary and two different periods of torture in Castel Sant'Angelo mixed in with study under Vittorino da Feltre and John Argyropoulos, membership in Pomponio Leto's Roman Academy, and positions as papal abbreviator and prefect of the Vatican Library. The *Lives of the Popes*, a major work of humanist historiography, is worthy of its flamboyant author. In some senses an apology for the Papacy, the book firmly anchors the birth of the church in pagan Rome, where its early saints are regularly compared to the corrupt clergy of Platina's day, to the disadvantage of the latter, especially Paul II, the pope who had imprisoned and tortured Platina. The book was very popular, going through twenty-five printings before the mid-seventeenth century and being translated into the major western European languages, yet it ended up on the index and was finally republished in censored form. The third volume in this group is a different sort of animal. In principle a revision of texts published over twenty-five years ago, this book offers several works of great importance in the history of western thought whose textual status and reception are unusually complex. Their author, Marsilio Ficino (1433-1499), is justly famous as the man whose Latin translations of the dialogues of Plato in 1484 played a major role in the Renaissance revival of that author. The *Phaedrus*, with its discussion of such key themes as love and rhetoric and its use of famous metaphors like the chariot of the soul, is one of the most important of Plato's dialogues, providing an additional justification for republication (along with the fact that the original has long been out of print). Since the 1496 edition in which it appeared in this form, "the *Phaedrus* commentary" has meant the documents printed here: a general title, an argument divided into three chapters from the 1484 edition, a postscript for these three chapters, eight new chapters, a postscript, a new title, and fifty-three *summae* of varying lengths. In this form, as Allen put it, the *Phaedrus* commentary "remained in cartoon" (xxxv), a sketch for a tapestry that was never fully woven. Added to this volume is Ficino's introduction to the *Ion*, a dialogue on poetic inspiration whose popularity was also great.

The other three volumes under review represent in some sense a collection of smaller works. Cristoforo Landino (1424-1498) is perhaps better known for his Platonizing commentaries on Virgil

and Dante (he was Ficino's teacher), but he also wrote the *Xandra*, a collection of Latin poetry that has attracted significant scholarly interest of late (see Christoph Pieper, *Elegos redolere Vergiliosque sapere: Cristoforo Landinos 'Xandra' zwischen Liebe und Gesellschaft* (Hildesheim: Olms, 2008)). These three books of Latin poems focus primarily on his love, Alessandra, but they also chronicle his life, friendships, interest, and growing political awareness from his late adolescence to his middle thirties. Chatfield's volume also contains an earlier redaction of Book 1 and some miscellaneous poems by Landino. Bartolomeo Scala (1430-1497) lived and worked in these same circles, competing unsuccessfully with Landino for a chair at the university but attaining greater success in politics, rising through a series of offices to become first chancellor of Florence. His writings reflect this environment, drawing on manuscripts in Cosimo de' Medici's library like Lucretius's *De rerum natura* and on the Platonic material that Ficino was working on. His fables and dialogue on law were known and admired, but his most important work was his *Defense against the Detractors of Florence*, which plays a part in the development of modern republican theory. The final volume contains writings on religion by Nicolas of Cusa (1401-1464), who is best known for his *The Catholic Concordance*, which is not presented here. His shorter works include pieces connected with the Council of Basel, a series of works in which he emerged as a champion of the pope, a group of more metaphysical speculations on matters of faith and doctrine, and several final calls for reform. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)