



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

FALL - WINTER 2010

Vol. 68

Nos. 3&4

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 58, Nos. 3&4

---

# SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 68, Nos. 3&4

FALL-WINTER, 2010

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

University of Akron  
and  
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](mailto:scn@tamu.edu)  
[www-english.tamu.edu/pubs/scn/  
journals.tdl.org/scn](http://www-english.tamu.edu/pubs/scn/journals.tdl.org/scn)

ISSN 0037-3028

# SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

## EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON

Texas A&M University

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

James Egan, University of Akron  
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo  
Patricia Garcia, University of Texas  
E. Joe Johnson, Clayton State University  
Matthew E. Davis, Texas A&M University

## EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Elise A. Beck, Texas A&M University

## CONTENTS

VOLUME 68, NOS. 3&4..... FALL-WINTER, 2010

### REVIEWS

- Matt Cohen, *The Networked Wilderness: Communicating in Early New England*;  
Jonathan Beecher Field, *Errands into the Metropolis: New England Dissidents  
in Revolutionary London*; and Martha L. Finch, *Dissenting Bodies: Corporealities  
in Early New England*. "Resituating Anglo-American Colonial Textuality":  
A Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK ..... 125
- Johann Valentin Andreae. *Rosenkreuzerschriften*, ed. and trans. by Roland  
Edighoffe, and *Schriften zur christlichen Reform*, ed. and trans. by Frank  
Böhling. Review by DONALD R. DICKSON ..... 133
- Nabil Matar, *Europe Through Arab Eyes, 1578-1727*. Review by TAREK  
EL-ARISS ..... 136
- Feisal Mohamed, *In the Anteroom of Divinity: the Reformation of the Angels from  
Colet to Milton*. Review by CHRISTOPHER BAKER..... 139
- Mandy Green, *Milton's Ovidian Eve*. Review by  
MARGARET OLOFSON THICKSTUN ..... 142
- James Dougal Fleming, *Milton's Secrecy and Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Review  
by W. SCOTT HOWARD..... 144
- Stephen B. Dobranski, *A Variorum Commentary on the Poems of John Milton:  
Samson Agonistes*. Review by REUBEN SANCHEZ ..... 149
- Louis Schwartz, *Milton and Maternal Mortality*. Review by  
KATHRYN R. MCPHERSON ..... 156
- Kevin Curran, *Marriage, Performance, and Politics at the Jacobean Court*. Review  
by M. L. STAPLETON..... 159
- Jeffrey Theis, *Writing the Forest in Early Modern England: A Sylvan Pastoral  
Nation*. Review by DONOVAN SHERMAN..... 162

Ernest Gilman, <i>Plague Writing in Early Modern England</i> . Review by JOHN GIBBS .....	166
Ryan J. Stark, <i>Rhetoric, Science, and Magic in Seventeenth-Century England</i> . Review by JACOB A. CEDILLO TOOTALAN .....	169
Scott L. Newstok, <i>Quoting Death in Early Modern England: The Poetics of Epitaphs Beyond the Tomb</i> . Review by GREG BENTLEY .....	173
Richard Dutton, <i>Ben Jonson, Volpone, and the Gunpowder Plot</i> . Review by ROBERT C. EVANS .....	177
Michael J. Redmond, <i>Shakespeare, Politics, and Italy: Intertextuality on the Jacobean Stage</i> . Review by HUGH F. WILSON.....	180
Jeff Persels, ed. <i>Spectacle. Studies in Early Modern France</i> . Review by ANNE E. DUGGAN.....	188
Jonathan Spangler, <i>The Society of Princes: The Lorraine-Guise and the Conservation of Power and Wealth in Seventeenth-Century France</i> . Review by PAUL COHEN.....	192
Francis J. Sypher, Jr., ed. and trans. <i>Liber A: 1628-1700 of the Collegiate Churches of New York</i> . Review by ALLAN J. JANSSEN.....	196
Rainer Decker, <i>Witchcraft &amp; the Papacy: An Account Drawing on the Formerly Secret Records of the Roman Inquisition</i> . Review by BRETT F. PARKER.....	198
Stephen Bull, <i>'The Furie of the Ordnance' Artillery in the English Civil Wars</i> . Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL .....	201
C. Scott Dixon, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass, eds., <i>Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe</i> . Review by ADAM SWANN .....	203
Christopher Dyer and Catherine Richardson, eds., <i>William Dugdale, Historian, 1605-1686: His Life, His Writings and His County</i> . Review by CHARLES W. A. PRIOR .....	206
Ariel Hessayon and Nicholas Keene, eds., <i>Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England</i> . Review by STEPHEN TAYLOR .....	209

John F. McDiarmid, ed., <i>The Monarchical Republic of Early Modern England: Essays in Response to Patrick Collinson</i> . Review by JOSEPH P. WARD.....	212
Jon Parkin, <i>Taming the Leviathan: The Reception of the Political and Religious Ideas of Thomas Hobbes in England 1640-1700</i> . Review by GEOFFREY M. VAUGHAN.....	215
Randy Robertson, <i>Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division</i> . Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN.....	219
Anthony Ashley Cooper, third earl of Shaftesbury, <i>Chartae Socraticae. Design of a Socratic History</i> . Edited by W. Benda, C. Jackson-Holzberg, F. A. Uehlein, and E. Wolff. Review by LAWRENCE E. KLEIN .....	221
Dirk van Miert, <i>Humanism in an Age of Science: The Amsterdam Athenaeum in the Golden Age, 1632-1704</i> . Review by JOSEPH M. MCCARTHY.....	225
Karen Bowen and Dirk Imhof, <i>Christopher Plantin and Engraved Book Illustrations in Sixteenth-Century Europe</i> . Review by LARRY SILVER .....	227
NEO-LATIN NEWS.....	231

## Resituating Anglo-American Colonial Textuality

Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

Matt Cohen. *The Networked Wilderness: Communicating in Early New England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010. x + 237 pp. \$67.50 (cloth); \$22.50 (paper).

Jonathan Beecher Field. *Errands into the Metropolis: New England Dissidents in Revolutionary London*. Hanover: Dartmouth College Press, 2009. xv + 154 pp. \$85.00 (cloth); \$35.00 (paper).

Martha L. Finch. *Dissenting Bodies: Corporealities in Early New England*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2010. xvi + 274. \$45.00.

Francis Bacon's understanding of rhetoric as merely a mechanism for disputation seems downright tepid compared to Plato's contention that rhetoric is an art form designed to rule minds. Bacon's sympathy for newly emergent scientific methods doubtless influenced his more scaled-down response to the power of rhetoric as a discipline. Even so, he hardly shied away from venturing into the choppy waters of rhetorical contention.

As his hortatory short essay "Of Plantations" indicates, Bacon supported the expansion of England's imperial power across the Atlantic. Before he died in 1626, he was personally involved in schemes for New World ventures. But, as Sarah Irving has explained "In a Pure Soil": Colonial Anxieties in the Work of Francis Bacon" (*History of European Ideas* 32 [2006]: 249-62), this natural philosopher held reservations about the possible deleterious effects of English imperialism. He worried that imperialist efforts could adversely affect both the furthering of truth in general and the lives of indigenous peoples in particular.

"Of Plantations" also expressed Bacon's concern over the personal character of the men sent to colonize the New World, an issue that John Smith would personally exploit in self-serving accounts of his transatlantic adventures. Bacon thought it sheer folly to expect English civilization to spread to distant regions when the emissaries of the empire were men of low moral caliber. Given his emphasis on

individual character in colonial endeavors, it is easy to imagine that had Bacon lived longer he might have taken considerable interest in the early rhetorical/textual sparring matches occasioned by various settlers' internecine squabbles. Possibly Bacon would have prized how certain colonial dissidents cleverly took advantage of the more open-ended possibilities of rhetorical disputation, as he understood it, to engage and prevail over the ruling establishment's presumably more authoritative rhetoric, as Plato understood it.

Recent discussions of early Anglo-American colonial culture have instructively featured dissidents as underdogs voicing legitimate grievances and also in possession of an impressive rhetorical acumen for airing those grievances. Usefully adding to this discussion, Jonathan Beecher Field's *Errands into the Metropolis* reveals various ways print media enabled the strategic rhetorical maneuvers of several disempowered political and religious figures in Rhode Island. How, Field asks, did such disfranchised individuals prevail argumentatively over entrenched and apparently more potent and influential writers speaking on behalf of established colonial governments? His answer is, in effect, that the best defense is a strong offense. In the cases considered in *Errands into the Metropolis*, dissidents facilitated their strong offense by framing their narratives in literary forms familiar to and valued by the homeland ruling elite.

As a result, the textual enterprises of these dissidents amounted less to a collective account of an errand into the wilderness (as Perry Miller titled one of his famous books in 1956) than of an errand into the metropolis. These works, in short, were designed as sturdy transatlantic vessels specifically fashioned to attract the regard of cosmopolitan Londoners. In books and in person, dissident authors proclaimed their English identity, especially in relation to sophisticated homeland attitudes prevalent among Parliamentary leaders. These authors understood that, in London at least, toleration was valued more as a pragmatic means to an imperialist end than as a high philosophical principle. Accessing this metropolitan sense of empire-facilitating pragmatism, dissidents represented the colonial governments as lagging behind the times and, even worse, as engaged in disfranchising English subjects, including (of course) the complaining authors. Often such charges of outrageous citizen abuse



included misunderstood and mistreated Native Americans, depicted as beleaguered English subjects.

In a particularly strong chapter, Field considers the influence of the pansophist linguistic manuals of 1630s and 1640s. These manuals, particularly *Janua Trilinguarum Reserata* by Czech philosopher Jan Amos Comenius, anticipated and likely tutored the dialogic structure and linguistic emphasis showcased in Roger Williams' *A Key into the Language of America* (1643). Within a Comenian framework, Field contends, Williams spoke for the Narragansett people as English citizens engaging in ordinary civil transactions. This portrait amounted to a strategy linking Williams' personal political and religious aims to Parliament's duty to supervise local governments in colonial America.

Samuel Gorton followed a similar course in *Simplicities Defence against Seven-Headed Policy* (1646), a cleverly constructed annotated anthology of evidentiary documents related to his personal complaints. Gorton's eccentric quasi-mystical religious beliefs probably mattered little in a cosmopolitan London rife with sects during the 1640s. What apparently did matter, Field reasonably suggests, was Gorton's rhetorical recasting of a backwater colonial religious argument into a substantial metropolitan political issue. Throughout his book Gorton emphasized his homeland identity, specifically the denial of his rights as an English colonial subject. And also similar to Williams, Gorton insisted on the need for Parliament to maintain a proper governmental oversight, especially across the Atlantic.

John Clarke likewise transmuted religious persecution into political capital in *IllNewes from New-England* (1652), a book that would serve as a model for later persecution narratives penned by Quakers. The title itself, Field observes, rewards close attention. As the book's argument eventually reveals, the title intimates that New England has fallen behind the times in contrast to the progressiveness of Old England. Clarke revised the official Puritan accounts of the Antinomians and other Rhode Island dissidents by elaborating on a genre of martyrdom chronicles derived from John Foxe's often-reprinted *Acts and Monuments* (1563). Clarke deftly associated his own plight with a broader portrait of religiously persecuted English citizens throughout history as well as across the Atlantic.

In *The Networked Wilderness* Matt Cohen shares Field's focus on the variety of rhetorical means used by dissident authors who strategically represented New England Puritan authority as both outmoded and an impediment to empire building. The colonial Puritan establishment, these authors protested, also violated the dignity and rights of English subjects, including Native Americans. Thomas Morton, for example, portrayed the Pilgrims as insufficiently cosmopolitan, too non-progressive to serve as salient agents of modern seventeenth-century English commerce.

Field and Cohen, however, disagree about the vectoring of the rhetorical devices employed by dissident authors. Field makes a good case for rereading several dissident narratives as recastings of literary forms familiar to the governing homeland elite during the early seventeenth century. But Cohen makes an even more innovative and fascinating—possibly a game changing—case for rereading such narratives, published before the installment of a printing press in Cambridge in 1638, as antagonistic to generic expectations. “The particular tactics and genres chosen for synthesis (or to produce dissonance) are significant in the analysis of any given work,” Cohen observes, “but we must be wary of allowing generic precedents to determine our readings” (117-18). Instead, Cohen maintains, “generic destabilization is a key tactic for writers of settlement texts, for whom establishing one's authority meant exhibiting a command of both difference and similarity” (118).

So, for instance, in Morton's *The New English Canaan* (1637) the Pilgrims' alleged deficit in cosmopolitanism was specifically pegged to their lack of linguistic sophistication. Local Plymouth officials desired to control all communication systems vital to English colonization, Morton complained, but they were not up to the task because they were blindsided by Old World paradigms. Morton represented the Pilgrims as inept agents incapable of crossing cultural and linguistic divides. The Plymouth colonists failed, in Morton's account, because they were not open to new, more expansive communication systems now made necessary by New World experiences, especially the complicating presence of Native Americans.

Morton, to be sure, dramatized himself as the perfect agent for the English transatlantic imperial enterprise. The maypole at Merry-

Mount instanced an advertisement for Morton's sophisticated capacity for transnational communication. His maypole, Cohen intriguingly argues, was a publishing venue with buckhorns and verse posted on it that impugned and challenged Plymouth colony's authority over colonial communication systems. The buckhorns indicated shared communication between Morton and Native Americans, while poems of ludic riddling expressed a form of insider discourse understood by Morton's associates and possibly some Native Americans. What these pole "publications" meant was apparently indecipherable to Plymouth officials. Such obscurity, including calculated allusions to the Classics and *Don Quixote*, not only countered Congregationalist biblical reading practices but also implied the Pilgrims' deficiency in cosmopolitan discourse.

The implicit insult, Cohen contends in a risk-taking move, went still deeper to include even the Dutch-dissenter influenced typographical features (genre gestures, images and marginalia) of *The New English Canaan*. Like the maypole, the very textual elements of Morton's book shouted international standards as if to highlight the author's verbal attack on the retrograde provincialism of the Plymouth officials.

As indicated by his consideration of Morton's use of buckhorns, Cohen's approach to early colonial communication systems, or social networks of signification, is very broad and not easily synopsized here. For him, conversation-like means of exchange (basically anxious contests for social and economic control) can include animal traps, footpaths, wampum (embellished shells), dances, animal imitations, ceremonial posts, medical rituals, sign language, cooked food, among other means for signifying intentions expressed "within a continuous informational topography" (28). Cohen "reads" such signs as texts that once were as rich and communicatively nuanced as were circulated missives and printed books.

Although Roger Williams' *A Key into the Language of America* raised questions about the sort of cultural coherence imagined in Morton's *The New English Canaan*, it nonetheless similarly validated a communication system freed from the limits of authorized Puritan interpretive paradigms. In fact, Cohen observes, Williams was deeply skeptical about the capacity of language to declare ultimate truth. Williams was also keenly aware of the Native American capacity to exploit semiotic

habits, and he valued a spontaneous ambient receptivity to intercommunication akin to his own position on a supra-rational spiritual openness to divine communication. Notice, too, Cohen advises, that even the perforated vertical line drawn between English and Indian words in *A Key* suggested (whether by design or accident) permeable boundaries open to crossing.

Permeable boundaries emerged as well in Edward Winslow's *Good News from New England* (1624). Winslow employed metaphors of consumption, blockage, elimination and flow to insinuate "a sense of speedy, dangerous flux in American Indian communication and slow, frustrating constipation in transatlantic messaging" (78). Combining female domestic knowledge and male frontier agency, Winslow doctored more than a Wampanoag sachem's bout of food poisoning during "a difficult time for digestion in New England" (74). He medicated the communication-divide between Native Americans and English colonists. In his book Winslow (similar to Morton) dramatized himself as an accomplished multi-lingual translator medically negotiating between Native American freedom and staid English custom. He did so, Cohen concludes, in ways intended to amend what he believed were misleading accounts of the resource-laden new land and also to celebrate a healthy reciprocal exchange of food and texts between colony and homeland.

As a principal commodity of social exchange, Martha L. Finch explains in *Dissenting Bodies*, colonial foodstuffs can be studied like narratives replete with nuanced evidence of settlers' experiences in the New World. Finch treats foodways as the most important element in a cultural network of ideas defined by the Plymouth founders' religious attitudes toward the human body. Besides their response to food, this network included concepts pertaining to illness, health, speech, gesture and dress. These cultural ingredients "can be read like texts" (23), all underwritten by a pervasive belief in the interpenetration of the spiritual and material realms.

On eight or so occasions in her book Finch takes vague and clichéd jabs at the frayed straw figures of Max Weber and Perry Miller to reaffirm the by now well-known fact that early Plymouth colonists did not perceive a wide separation between the body and the soul. Although the Pilgrims believed that "one's body ... revealed the state

of one's inner soul" (134), they were nonetheless ambivalent about the body. More specifically, Finch reminds us, these colonists believed that animal passions associated with the body always threatened reason and will. "When the rational mind and godly heart were abandoned and the animal passions and appetites ruled, humans took on the physical characteristics and moral qualities of beasts" (49).

Whatever precisely might constitute the "moral qualities of beasts" Finch does not say, but instead delves into pastor John Robinson's qualms over Myles Standish's massacre of some Native Americans. To protect a ragtag neighboring settlement, Captain Standish lured these victims to a conference, slaughtered them in a locked room and then displayed the head of one of them for six months outside a meetinghouse. Finch interprets this last event as a posted "text": "For Plymouth's saints, Indians' severed heads—safely dead yet animated with vital meanings—functioned as visible icons of God's goodness and sovereign authority" (59-60).

It follows that if the Plymouth founders were ambivalent about what their own bodies signified spiritually, they were even more concerned—for safety's sake, at the very least—with interpreting "textual" clues pertaining to Native American bodies. They tried to "read" these bodies, decode their corporeal signs. So, in two telling occasions, they thought they could discern a difference between Massasoit's looks and manners, and Wituwamat's speech and gestures. Precisely how these perfectly normal efforts at corporeal interpretation distinctly differed from what people generally did then, and still do now, whenever socially encountering others is left unaddressed as Finch moves on to an episode involving Edward Winslow and Stephen Hopkins. Both were invited to sleep in Massasoit's bed with his wife and others, but keenly "aware of their discomforted bodies" (200), the shocked visitors soon departed.

Unsurprisingly, discomfort with Native American bodies coalesced with discomfort with wild nature. This "howling wilderness" motif is certainly old hat, but Finch renders a full dress rehearsal of colonists' fears of contamination by the baleful New World environment: "It was especially during the first years of colonization that Plymouth's saints felt the wilderness's potential to consume them utterly, body and soul" (70). The wilderness, it seems, enacted a double agency as a

foodway. The Pilgrims' characteristic response was hard work aimed at transforming such a sinister landscape into an English garden. Then, instead of being "consumed" by nature, the settlers would benefit from "increased physical health and material gain as they ingested New England air, foodstuffs, land, and resources" (70).

As this wonky image of "ingested ... land" suggests, it is hard to avoid the impression that *Dissenting Bodies* brings little more to the table than (in Finch's overwrought phrasing) "corporeal metaphor[s] of eating" (97)—metaphors either simply or maladroitly applied to our already well-established and most basic understandings of early English colonial culture. Such an indulgent metaphoric feast can strain rational digestion, as when Finch promises to examine the "*fluid accretion* of the metaphorical and the literal in early New England" (27; emphasis added). Here is a more typical example: "Resisting such overt grasping for material wealth and status, [William] Bradford consumed New England's abundance through biblical metaphors and spiritual meanings" (97).

Such indulgence, the very antithesis of the moderation Puritans revered, returns me to Francis Bacon's "Of Plantations." Bacon advised rational temperance in colonial endeavors, especially in exchanges with indigenous peoples. His ideal goal was incremental improvement—intellectual and material advancement for Native Americans, English colonists and the homeland. Unfortunately, history would thoroughly sully that New Atlantis ideal.

But at least Bacon was on the mark in believing that printing radically changed the world. It is easy to imagine his ghost nodding its approval of the scope of Field's and Cohen's investigative curiosity about cause and form assessed in relation to agreement, difference and variation. And would not his phantom be pleasantly surprised by how Field's and Cohen's wide-ranging explorations of dissident textuality exploit the permeable boundaries of even Bacon's own understanding of rhetoric as only a mechanism for disputation?

Johann Valentin Andreae. *Rosenkreuzerschriften*. Edited and translated by Roland Edighoffer. Volume 3 of *Gesammelte Schriften*. Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann, general editor. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: frommann-holzboog, 2010. 544 pp. €254.

Johann Valentin Andreae. *Schriften zur christlichen Reform*. Edited and translated by Frank Böhling. Volume 6 of *Gesammelte Schriften*. Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann, general editor. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: frommann-holzboog, 2010. 404 pp. €103. Review by DONALD R. DICKSON, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

Two new volumes have now been added to the projected twenty volume edition of the collected works of Johann Valentin Andreae (1586-1654), under the general editorship of Wilhelm Schmidt-Biggemann of the Free University of Berlin. Four others have already appeared: *Veri Christianismi Solidaeque Philosophiae Libertas* (1618), edited by Frank Böhling in 1994; some biographical works in 1995; the *Theca Gladii Spiritus* (1616), edited by Frank Böhling and Carlos Gilly in 2000; and *Theophilus* edited by Jana Matlová and Jiří Beneš in 2002. The first of the new volumes addresses the issue of the secret brotherhood of the Rosicrucians which has defined the reputation of Andreae ever since 1614 when the anonymous collection of pamphlets, which the editor Roland Edighoffer, professor emeritus of German at the Sorbonne, calls the *Rosenkreuzerschriften*. While they first appeared in print in Kassel in 1614, they had circulated for some years in manuscript, since Adam Haselmayr had seen a copy in the Tyrol by 1610 and published a formal reply in 1612, i.e., the kind of public acknowledgement that the manifestos had requested of their sympathizers. For centuries the only real link between Andreae and these two manifestos was the name Christian Rosenkreutz taken from Andreae's youthful romance, the *Chymische Hochzeit Christiani Rosenkreutz Anno 1459*, which was written in 1605. Evidence of Andreae's direct involvement in the composition of the *Fama fraternitatis* and the *Confessio fraternitatis*, though, was discovered independently and nearly simultaneously by Edighoffer and Martin Brecht in the late 1970s. In a commemorative work for his friend Tobias Hess, titled *Theca gladii spiritus, sententias quasdam breves vereque philosophicas continens*, Andreae had

gathered together thoughts and notes from Hess's manuscripts. The *Theca* contained enough citations from Andreae's own published work to make clear that they had worked collaboratively. Most importantly, it also contained quotations from the recently published *Confessio* and *Invitatio fraternitatis Christi*, which was issued in two parts in 1617 and 1618. Andreae, who alone was responsible for these selections, can thus be linked definitively to one of the central Rosicrucian tracts, the *Confessio*. Edighoffer's and Brecht's scholarship led to a renewal of interest in Andreae as an intellectual figure in the early seventeenth century and gave a certain momentum for this massive collected works edition.

The first of the Rosenkreuzerschriften were printed in 1614, anonymously. Also included was a translation by Christoph Besold (a prominent professor at Tübingen and friend of Andreae's) of the twenty-sixth chapter of Traiano Boccalini's *Ragguagli di Parnaso* (1612-1613), titled the *Allgemeine und General Reformation, der gantzen weiten Welt*, which called for a second reformation and a new society based on Christian charity. With it was the *Fama Fraternitatis, Deß Löblichen Ordens des Rosenkreutzes, an alle Gelehrte und Häupter Europæ geschrieben*, which proclaimed the existence of a secret fraternity in possession of esoteric knowledge that asked for a declaration from those wishing to join their brotherhood of the learned. The following year the other essential tract, the *Confessio fraternitatis R. C.*, was published with the *Fama* (the Boccalini chapter was then abandoned). The furor that ensued from these mysterious proclamations has enveloped Andreae in controversy ever since. Because most of Andreae's life was spent in service to the Lutheran church, some have denied any involvement on his part whatsoever in drafting the manifestos, while, at the other extreme, modern day Rosicrucians have erected a temple in honor of their "founder" at Calw where he spent nineteen years as pastor.

Roland Edighoffer's introductory essay, based on his own research and that of Brecht, Richard van Dülmen, and Carlos Gilly, offers a brief sketch of Andreae's life and of his intellectual circle in Tübingen. Edighoffer argues that Andreae, who saw himself as a Christian Hercules capable of rescuing church and state from its moral decline, wrote the *Fama* just after his expulsion from Tübingen (in 1607) as compensation for his disappointments. In his edition Edighoffer



publishes the Boccalini chapter (*Allgemeine und General Reformation*), the *Fama* and the *Confessio*, as well as Andreae's *Chymische Hochzeit Christiani Rosenkreutz. Anno 1459*, a romance that is loosely tied to the two primary Rosicrucian tracts through the imaginary hero Christian Rosencreutz, whose seven day journey to attend a royal wedding is an allegory with spiritual and/or alchemical meanings. For his edition, Edighoffer collates multiple editions of each text (e.g., eight different editions of the *Fama* are used along with four manuscripts) and lists the textual variants, which extend to 160 pages. For example, the place name "Damasco" on page 140 of the *Fama* is used in five other printed editions, but given as "Damcar" in three manuscript sources and the Errata page of the first edition. Since his copy-text is the first edition of each work (including both the Latin and German texts of the *Confessio*), he also provides useful glosses at the foot of each page to help the reader overcome the hurdles posed by the archaic German word forms. A handful of explanatory notes are also included in this important new edition of the *Rosenkreuzerschriften*.

Frank Böhling's edition of *Schriften zur christlichen Reform* presents German translations of Andreae's essential treatises on religious and social reform that were written in part to counter the misappropriation of his ideas in the furor over the *Rosenkreuzerschriften*. These are the *Invitatio Fraternitatis Christi ad Sacri Amoris Candidatos* (parts I and II; 1617-18), *Christianae Societatis Imago* (1620), *Christiani Amoris Dextera Porrecta* (1620), and *Verae Unionis in Christo Jesu Specimen* (1628). Despite the public outcry over the Rosicrucian manifestos, Andreae and his circle continued to advance utopian ideals through these *Schriften zur christlichen Reform* and through his fictional utopia *Christianopolis* (1619). While copies of his two utopian tracts, *Christianae societatis imago*, published anonymously in Strasbourg (1619; Tübingen, 1620), and *Christiani amoris dextera porrecta* (Tübingen, 1620; Strasbourg, 1621), are rare, they did circulate widely as scribal publications, as demonstrated by the manuscript copies discovered by G. H. Turnbull among the papers of Samuel Hartlib, who had them translated by John Hall and published in 1647 at Cambridge as *A Modell of a Christian Society* and *The Right Hand of Christian Love Offered*. We also know about Andreae's attempt to found a brotherhood through his letters, some of which Böhling includes in an appendix. Andreae's important letter of 27

June 1642 to Duke August of Braunschweig-Lüneburg makes clear that the *Christiani amoris dextra porrecta* and the *Christianae Societatis Imago* were a reaction against that “undignified jest of the fictitious Rosicrucian Fraternity” [Andreae: *informem hanc Societatis alicujus Christianae imaginem, machinatus sum, quam fictitiae Fraternitatis Rosecruciae ludibrio indigno opponeremus*; Böhling: *diese Skizze einer christlichen Gesellschaft dem unwürdigen Scherz der erdichteten Rosenkreuzerbruderschaft entgegenzustellen* (343, 345)]. In his introduction, Böhling aptly describes these works as the “Verchristlichung der Rosenkreuzermythe” and summarizes what is known about this chapter in Andreae’s life story, especially his friendship with Wilhelm Wense, Christoph Besold, and others, with whom Andreae sought to establish the Christian brotherhood he envisioned in his writings. The editor offers a straight forward German translation of Andreae’s more elegant Latin style on facing pages. The few textual variants are given at the bottom of each page. The commentary is helpful and would be even more so had it been placed at the bottom of the page (where the textual apparatus is now).

This new edition of the *Schriften zur christlichen Reform* makes available to readers what ought to be the essential legacy of Johann Valentin Andreae, a legacy that has been unfortunately obscured by the unavailability texts. As such, it is a most welcome addition to Andrea scholarship. With each new volume of the *Gesammelte Schriften* that appears, the portrait of this educational and social reformer, who so embodied the Protestant culture of Germany in the transition from Renaissance to Baroque, becomes more complete.

Nabil Matar. *Europe Through Arab Eyes, 1578-1727*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009. xxviii + 313 pp. Review by TAREK EL-ARISS, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

In this erudite and beautifully written book, Nabil Matar tells an untold story about Christian-Muslim relations in the early modern period. Often suppressed or ignored by historians, this period comes to life in Matar’s text as a dynamic stage of cultural and political exchanges between Europe and the Muslim world. Challenging the epistemological paradigm that situates the East-West encounter as

one between Europe and the Middle East (Crusades, Ottoman empire), Matar introduces the role of the Western Arab world, namely the Maghreb (Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, and Libya) in shaping this relation. This focus allows him to identify an encounter that could no longer be explained through the now canonical models of imperialism and orientalism. Examining writings by captives and state officials going back and forth between Europe and the Maghreb, Matar provides in the first part of his book a historical contextualization and analysis of Christian-Muslim relations in the early modern period. The book's second part consists of letters and correspondences, and various descriptions of wars and expulsions, exquisitely rendered in Matar's translation.

Engaging works by European and Arab scholars from Fernand Braudel to Aziz al-Azmeh, Matar presents a clear picture of the prevailing cultural and political conditions that determined Muslim-Christian encounters during that period. He discusses both the difficulties and possibilities involved in these encounters, which are staged as much through in anxiety and fear as through fascination and curiosity. He discusses the military expansion of such European powers as Portugal, England, and France; the role of piracy in determining perceptions and exchanges between the various parts of the Mediterranean; and the importance of the Moriscos' expulsion from Spain and their settling in North Africa in shaping these encounters.

Matar debunks the notion that Arabs and Muslims were simply uninterested in Europe; the scarcity of Arab sources on Europe is partly explained in Matar's book through a discussion of the problematic access of Muslim ships and travelers to European ports and cities. Going a step further—and this is the book's important methodological contribution—Matar argues that in order to identify Muslim perceptions of Europe during that time period, one should also examine *other* historical materials such as letters and captivity narratives by important figures and commoners. "Microhistory," writes Matar, "can uncover evidence to challenge the prevalent theories about early modern Arabic and Islamic ignorance about Christendom" (19). Through this methodological approach, in line with the work of such historians as Carlo Ginzburg, he reconfigures what constitutes a historical document. Matar's attention to the non-canonical or non-

official text is a gesture that liberates the writing of history, opening it up to other cultural forms that involve descriptions, reports, and letters. This approach, in this particular context especially, exposes the Eurocentric bias that has thus far governed the study of the Muslim perception of Europe during that period.

The originality of Matar's research lies in his unearthing of an Arabic *corpus captivitis*. Captivity was an ever-present reality, haunting inhabitants of the Maghreb's cities and coasts. Matar quotes proverbs that capture this reality and call attention to its horror: "Luck is in three things, [a good] marriage, [avoiding] captivity, and crossing the sea [safely]" (40). Arabic narratives of captivity were made up mostly of letters sent to family members, rulers, and coreligionists. Matar discusses letters sent from slaves describing mistreatment and other affairs pertaining to battles and politics. These accounts were so appreciated in North Africa that captives were encouraged to report on European military plans and other hostile intentions. Matar focuses on these narratives' epistemological production, reading them as sites of coercion that generate important forms of learning and interactions. He identifies instances where captivity led to intellectual collaborations, thereby giving rise to books, maps, and other cultural artifacts attributed to both Europe and North Africa.

These textual mediations and religious conversions of captives in some cases reveal a complex picture. We learn from Matar that some Maghreb rulers, for instance, ransomed not only Muslim but also Jewish and Christian subjects, and captives gained prominence as state officials while in captivity. This enabled the emergence of a multilingual and multi-cultural bureaucracy in Europe and in the Maghreb. Matar discusses letters exchanged by ambassadors and government representatives written in French, Arabic, Spanish, and English. He reveals that treatises, contracts, and official letters were written in either of these languages. For instance, Moriscos in North Africa continued to use Spanish to conduct official business long after their expulsion. This shows a level of cultural exchange and multilingualism seldom acknowledged when examining this time period.

Matar's strategic emphasis on the slipperiness of texts that lie at the intersection of captivity narratives and official reports reveals the effectiveness of his methodological approach. This slipperiness reflects

the state of captives themselves, situated in-between cultural spaces, forced to gain knowledge of the culture of the other in extenuating circumstances. By examining how these texts shift and go back and forth between different states and locales, Matar demonstrates that the text itself, the “elite text” produced by the state representative or the “expert,” is in fact an unstable historical document. This text can only be read in juxtaposition to that of the captive, often suppressed in the historical investigation.

The exchange of ambassadors and the exchange and ransoming of captives between Europe and North Africa, in addition to the texts they produced and the interchangeability of their positions—all these things, beautifully captured and discussed in Matar’s text—characterize this early modern period. Matar identifies a period of instability that involves constant cultural and political negotiations both for the freedom of captives and for trade between states. Knowledge circulates both peacefully and violently through the exchange of books and also through pirate raids and captivity. However, this often violent and coercive exchange is not reduced to its violence: Europe is not simply a hegemonic power seeking to control and subdue its neighbors to the south. Matar sees in this violence epistemological possibilities and openings vis-à-vis the other. Through this microhistorical approach, Matar identifies the processes of translation and cross-cultural representation as the key characteristics of this time period. It is this back and forth between European and Arabic texts and archives—the back and forth of ambassadors, captives, and contemporary scholars—that this new history, full of possibilities, comes to life in Matar’s book.

Feisal Mohamed. *In the Anteroom of Divinity: the Reformation of the Angels from Colet to Milton*. University of Toronto Press, 2008. xiv + 242pp. 6 plates. \$55.00. Review by CHRISTOPHER BAKER, ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY

Despite their nonmaterial nature, angels maintained a palpable presence within the religious and literary compositions of early modern England. Feisal Mohamed’s monograph charts their influence from the Henrician era through the end of the Interregnum by trac-

ing the changing impact of the works of the first-century Platonist, Dionysius the Areopagite. His *Celestial Hierarchy*, *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, *Divine Names*, and *Mystical Theology* shaped the understanding of angels and the spiritual hierarchy of heaven for medieval scholastics. Even though the detailed structure of his thought, like the monasteries of Henry VIII, underwent its own dissolution as the tide of Reformation thought advanced within England, remnants of it persisted through the close of the seventeenth century.

English humanism felt the impress of Dionysian thought through the commentaries on his work by John Colet. Colet's own conception of angelic hierarchy is influenced by Ficino's observations on Dionysius, yet Colet departs from Ficino's unrestrained praise of human nature, and he also appears to have been influenced by St. Bonaventure's sympathy for the Franciscan renewal of Roman Catholic piety. Bonaventure's de-emphasis upon the hierarchy of the church magisterium in favor of one based upon the contemplative quality of the clergy injects a Franciscan reformist element into Colet's ideas. Mohamed also finds Dionysian roots in Richard Hooker's concepts of hierarchy as expressed in *The Lawes of Ecclesiastical Polity*, especially in his comments on the mystical nature of worship and the spiritual capabilities of the ordained clergy: "episcopal ecclesiology and traditional liturgy are an extension of angelic ministration and a reflection of heavenly devotion" (43). Spenser's *Four Hymns* move the idea of spiritual hierarchy in a more decidedly Protestant direction, and "the final hymn registers a Reformed skepticism of mystical flight most famously seen in Luther" (50). Nevertheless, both Colet and Spenser generally retain an affinity for the transcendent which recalls Dionysian themes.

The chapter on John Donne opens with a close reading of "Aire and Angels" which stresses Donne's poetic syncretism. Mohamed wishes to defend the poem against charges that its composite ideas make up little more than an "intellectual toy chest" (62), but the exact way in which the poem contributes to what he sees as "a consistent view of divine economy underpinning early and late work, verse and prose" (62) deserves more clarity. Donne's appropriation of Dionysian thought is held in tension with the other intellectual currents within his work, but the poet's lengthiest commentary on angels in his All

Saint's Day sermon of 1623 displays a strongly reformist tendency. His sermons reveal a Calvinist emphasis upon the mystical interpretation of scripture which supersedes the role of church hierarchy, while his poetry's stress upon "grace and the Word" discloses a "Dionysian angelology and mysticism" (77).

John Milton rightly figures prominently in the book's final three chapters, but Mohamed comments as well upon the Dionysian presence in several of Milton's contemporaries. The angelology of Henry Lawrence enhances his pro-Cromwell stance by emphasizing a transition of angelic authority to the Puritan elect, and the more republican Henry Vane deemphasizes angelic influence still further; both of them shared, as did Milton, a stress upon the election and illumination of individuals over against angelic direction. While Milton adheres to a traditional hierarchy of Seraphim and Cherubim in *Paradise Lost*, this ranking obtains only in Hell, an implicit critique of the Dionysian celestial architecture. The final two chapters address Raphael and Michael, the first a doctor of souls and the second an apocalyptic prophet of earthly corruption. Rather than Adam (not the brightest of students) being the primary student of Raphael's knowledge in the mold of Milton's *Of Education*, the angel's "true pupils are the inhabitants of the fallen world who must rely on such knowledge" (136). Adam's creatureliness, though unfallen, is a cautionary reminder of the limits of material being and its far greater shortcomings after the fall. Michael's role as champion of a renewed national church in *Lycidas* evolves into his function as "protector of the elect provided in Revelation" (143). Mohamed contextualizes this evolution of Michael's purpose in a lengthy review of Milton's prose tracts which chart a gradual shift in emphasis from the election of a godly nation-state to that of saintly individuals. Michael's prophetic function in the epic thus replaces his accustomed identity as heavenly victor against Satan and his minions. Rather than a traditionally Dionysian host of angelic mediators between heaven and earth, Milton finally offers us fit angels, though few. Michael and Raphael are exemplary and singular agents after whom fallen yet elect humans can model the growth of a paradise within.

This monograph will be essential reading for students of angelology in English and European culture. Mohamed's command of

Milton's canon is thorough, and his illuminating critical conclusions are supported by close readings of numerous relevant and recondite primary sources as well as contemporary scholars.

Mandy Green. *Milton's Ovidian Eve*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2009. xi + 235 pp. \$99.95. Review by MARGARET OLOFSON THICKSTUN, HAMILTON COLLEGE.

In this book, Mandy Green argues that Ovid's "interest in female subjectivity" made his *Metamorphoses* a fruitful source for Milton's development of Eve's interiority. As Green points out, "fewer and fewer readers are as well equipped to appreciate Milton's subtle and varied use of the *Metamorphoses* as his own 'fit audience'" (10). She proposes, by close attention to verbal echoes, parallels, and other relationships, to "help the modern reader speculate more precisely about what Milton may have had in mind when, in his own reworking of the mythographic tradition, he invites us to see Eve in a series of Ovidian guises" (7). Green can be a careful close reader—her explorations of relationships between Eve's birth scene and both the stories of Narcissus and Echo, as well as her discussion of how analyzing the story of Daphne might help to illuminate the problem of Eve's consent, are illuminating and provocative—but she offers no clear or comprehensive argument about what she thinks Milton is, in fact, trying to do in creating his portrait of Eve: sometimes he appears to be allowing resonances (Daphne, Narcissus); at other times he appears to be closing off possibilities. I am willing to read a discussion of how Milton uses Ovidian analogues to guide his readers' responses to and understanding of his story; I am willing to read a discussion that exposes how Milton's engagement with Ovidian moments creates resonances he cannot control. But I would like to know which I am reading or what the criteria are by which a person decides whether, at any given moment, Milton is or is not in control. About two chapters into this book, I went back to the beginning, re-reading the introductory material and then the first two chapters to try to figure that out. I remain confused.



Green is capable of writing elegant and lucid sentences. Unfortunately, her prose is littered with passive constructions that obscure agency so thoroughly that it becomes impossible to determine whether the potential resonances Green finds between Eve and her mythological counterparts are ones Milton invited, ones his contemporary readers might have recognized despite Milton's attempts to control connections, or ones that Green herself has discovered. Subsections often begin with rehearsals of plot rather than claims about how the examination of a particular moment in *Paradise Lost* or the *Metamorphoses* will contribute to the overall argument. Paragraphs often follow suit, with Green's own point about a moment or critical claim buried mid-paragraph.

Sometimes, the point is impossible to find: in a paragraph beginning, "according to Ovid, it is to Venus we owe the foundations of human society" (105), Green discusses in swift succession an excerpt from the *Fasti*, a stanza from the *Faerie Queene*, a moment from *Paradise Lost*, and a quotation from Sylvester's translation of DuBartas's *Divine Weeks*. She then writes, "When Eve disappears from view, it is the yearning for her continued presence by those who follow her departure with their eyes, which is the point of emphasis" (106), without any indication that she has brought the discussion back to *Paradise Lost* or guidance about how this desire to keep Eve in sight demonstrates Eve's civilizing influence. In fact, the paragraph then veers into a discussion of Christopher Ricks's close reading of this passage's "disquieting effect," which so undermines the earlier claims of the paragraph that it completely loses its thread. It ends asserting that "we are confronted with the simple fact that to see Eve is to desire to keep her continually in sight" (107) and that, in two other moments of separation, Adam exhibits "a similar reaction"—except that the moment under discussion is not Eve's disappearing after her creation but Eve's departing at the point when Adam has asked Raphael about astronomy, a moment when neither Raphael nor Adam seems even to notice her departure, let alone "to wish her still in sight."

This should have been a much better book. Readers, editors, and copy-editors all contributed to its failings, but the burden of responsibility rests with the author. Although Green acknowledges current criticism that explicitly addresses Milton's use of Ovid, she engages

the discussion of Eve as it stood twenty, even thirty, years ago. In a representative footnote that I have selected at random, Green points her readers toward the critical debate in “recent years” (160) and then cites articles from 1953, 1967, 1972, 1970, 1974, 1971, 1969, 1978, and 1980. This pattern is not simply intensely frustrating for a reader aware of the current conversation about Eve, about Milton’s attitudes toward sexuality, and about Milton’s theological positions, but it also leads Green to waste time refuting critical positions that have been long laid to rest and to credit without comment assertions long disproved. She exhibits no awareness of discussion surrounding the question of consent in the dream Satan whispers into Eve’s ear or of nuanced readings of the Separation Colloquy initiated by McColley’s *Milton’s Eve*, a book that Green mentions a couple of times but does not engage in any serious way.

At one point early on, Green asserts that “Milton deliberately fails to fix the meaning of [his Ovidian] allusions which thereby become a way of holding in solution unresolved, even contradictory emphases in a situation where alternatives are not yet exclusive and the future has not been fixed” (20). At her best, Green manages to stir that solution in ways that illuminate Milton’s art and design. Unfortunately, her treatment of Eve becomes more and more focused on using Ovid to fix interpretation, and, although she argues vehemently against the idea of the Fortunate Fall, the interpretation she seems set on is that Eve as flawed and fallen from the start. Having criticized others for being “too eager to alert the reader when a simile, borrowed episode or oblique allusion seems to draw Eve into a web of implication from whose inexorable sequel she cannot escape” (19), Green herself winds about Eve the sticky threads of implication.

James Dougal Fleming. *Milton’s Secrecy and Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Aldershot, England, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing, 2008. xiii + 196 pp. \$99.95. Review by W. SCOTT HOWARD, UNIVERSITY OF DENVER.

*Milton’s Secrecy and Philosophical Hermeneutics* offers a compellingly learned yet inconsistently lucid study in apophysis: Fleming has much to explain about what his book will not accomplish. Neither empirical

nor ‘objectivist’ (and emphatically not deconstructive, or historicist, or intentionalist) *Milton’s Secrecy* challenges an hermeneutics of discovery that has informed the horizons of Milton’s literary reception at least since Richard Bentley’s 1732 emendation of *secret* to ‘sacred’ in *PL* 1.6. Whereas “most Milton scholars ... argue or assume, implicitly or explicitly, that studying [or editing] the poet’s work entails a search for hidden meaning” (4)—hence, the plurality of interpretive methodologies throughout the twentieth century predicated upon esotericism—Fleming aims to correct that bias for secrecy and discovery by returning to Milton’s textuality (ix-x) and the apt placement of his works within a nearly forgotten tradition of early-modern exotericism (6-25). Fleming’s Milton “is the great poet of the exoteric world ... hostile to any hermeneutics, and to any epistemology, that devolves on the category of secrecy” (161).

Consistent with Milton’s Arian theology and cosmology, the God of *Paradise Lost* therefore retains the sole right to secrecy; discovery (though not the dialogic work of knowing) is banned from Paradise, and the quest for hidden ‘secret’ meaning functions as “the Miltonic keyword of Satanic sin” and human fallenness (10). Milton’s secrecy thus involves an inter-textual counter-principle of anti-secrecy. His major poems (e.g. *Lycidas*, *A Masque at Ludlow Castle*, *Samson Agonistes*) and key pamphlets (e.g. *The Reason of Church-Government*, *Areopagitica*, *De Doctrina Christiana*) progressively question the hermeneutics of discovery (including self-discovery) by charting possible ways “out of the fall” (14) via philosophical hermeneutics, which Fleming defines in strictly Gadamerian terms, especially *Erfahrung*—“knowledge as an involving experience” (26)—and *Gespräch*—dialogue or conversation “theorized as the real mode of understanding” (119).

The complete arc of Milton’s works and days constitutes the full disclosure of that knowing and understanding: “Milton’s exotericism is what makes Milton Milton” (29). Notwithstanding Fleming’s vigorous protests against biocriticism (31-55), however, *Milton’s Secrecy* recapitulates one of the most persistent and resilient interpretive models in the field—the notion of *the rising poet*, introduced by Louis Martz in 1965—whereby, in this case, *Paradise Regained* manifests the poet’s ultimate repudiation of the hermeneutics of discovery. “Christ’s return to his privacy, after the successfully-resisted temptation, is

exactly congruent to Milton's own return home after the Italian journey" (171). Privacy, like secrecy, signals the immanence / imminence of esoteric and exoteric paths; thus for both figures privacy hinges upon a counter-principle of anti-privacy. The return home is always-already predicated upon privacy's abjuration and the prophet's / poet's proleptic acceptance of uncompelled commitment to public service.

Fleming's ambitious critique of esoteric inwardness, secrecy, and individualism—set forth in the volume's introduction, "Against Secrecy," and then sharpened in the concluding chapter, "Secrecy Again?"—shapes his book's center and circumference. Each section frames that thesis vis-à-vis different articulations of the early-modern exoteric tradition, brisk objections against the status quo hermeneutics of discovery in the field of Milton criticism, clever counter-readings of touchstones in Milton's major texts, and moments of sanguine engagement with an abridged version of Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics. Readers unfamiliar with the thought of Hans-Georg Gadamer may find Fleming's perspective refreshing and generative, yet may also wonder why, for example, Gadamer's theory of *Gespräch* would be permitted to stand utterly unmeasured against any of the standard verse or prose dialogues (whether English or European) from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—especially Torquato Tasso's treatise, *Discorso dell'arte del dialogo* (1585), with which Milton was familiar. Nevertheless, the early-modern, self-reflexive, exoteric tradition that Fleming underscores for the purpose of substantiating his analysis of the hermeneutics of discovery provides the volume's most interesting and useful contribution to the field. *Milton's Secrecy* elaborates upon recent studies by Linda Gregerson, Valentin Groebner, Kevin Sharpe, Debora Shuger, and Ramie Targoff to posit a distinctive early-modern English Protestant abjuration of inwardness, secrecy, and individualism: "a rhetorical turning of the psyche, not without discomfort, inside out ... predicated on a normative assumption of inwardness, but precisely as a moral redoubt that can be supra-normatively renounced" (73).

Chapter one, "Expressing the Conscience," applies that line of argument to a selection of works that dramatize the self-presentational casuistical mimesis of Milton's conscience: *The Reason of Church-Government*, *Apology for Smectymnuus*, *Second Defense of the English People*,

*Defense of Himself*, and especially *Lycidas*. These *mind-texts*, as Fleming calls them, “do not just give us insight into [Milton’s] conscience; they are his conscience, which is always-already mind-text” (33). Chapters two, “The Armor of Intention,” and three, “The Armor of Intension,” extend that inquiry to contiguous and contrastive interpretations of *A Masque at Ludlow Castle* and *Samson Agonistes*. In both, asserts Fleming, “Milton constructs an ideal of exoteric behavior, according to which intentional secrets must be displayed for all to see [because] Milton’s dramatic heroes must never attempt . . . the one thing that most critics assume to be normative: namely, a retreat from outward expression to inward and secret experience” (67). Fleming’s cogent formulation of the dynamics of early-modern English Protestant conscience (via Targoff especially) informs the crux of *Milton’s Secrecy*; the early-moderns “simply and simultaneously assume that their mind is inside, and that it is outside. Indeed, the inwardness of the mind seems to generate or require external figuration, and then to be explained and protected by that figuration” (69). *Comus* and *Samson* limn contrasting epiphenomenal images of that theoretical model: “where the Lady holds to an esoteric stance, expressly refusing to articulate her being, Samson expresses his being repeatedly and exoterically [because he is incarnated] with the meaning of divine selection” (94). Chapter four, “Talking and Learning in Paradise,” examines *Paradise Lost* in terms of dialogic questioning, the “final step in an exoteric series that began with Milton’s textualized conscience, and continued with the Lady’s (erroneously inward) and Samson’s (gloriously outward) intentionality” (129). Fleming’s just attention to the complexity of Satan’s and Gabriel’s comparative readings of God’s scales in *PL* 4 yields one of the book’s most illuminating transpositions of Gadamer’s thought. Milton’s great poem highlights the conditions for creaturely uncertainty (134) through persistent representations of “interpretive activity, not as an objectivist process of discovery, but as an applicative process of dialogic transformation” (139). The fall thus results from a swerve away from dialogue and toward objectivism (151). “To participate in dialogue is to participate in God” (158). Readers less friendly with post-structural hermeneutics may object, however, to Fleming’s occasionally apodictic statements, such as “Miltonic interpretation is true understanding through *Gespräch*” (164).

The decentering of early-modern subjectivity has certainly been one of the most vigorously devised and defended matters since the first wave of challenges (from the 1950s onward) against the humanistic-syncretic paradigm of the so-called Elizabethan world picture most famously popularized by E. M. W. Tillyard (ca. 1943). Key formulations of Milton's 'inwardness' have indeed been pivotal—arguably for *all* of the major twentieth-century studies in the field. *Milton's Secrecy* therefore proposes no middling task, especially given the provocative insight that “Miltonists have assumed discovery as the hermeneutic path to their various subject-matters; but they have not, in any significant way, turned to hermeneutic discovery as a subject-matter in and of itself” (5). Fleming invokes grounds for that capacious, double-edged charge within Milton's works, cultural context, and critical reception (especially since the rise and fall of deconstruction and new historicism), but ultimately engages (though not unreasonably) with a partisan selection of primary and secondary documents. Despite Fleming's rallying cry for the “worthy, endless work [of] hermeneutic, dialogic, questioning understanding [which] involves and mandates and absolutely demands a reiterative recognition and rejection of method” (172), *Milton's Secrecy* substitutes new binary oppositions (e.g. self-presentational reiterative mimesis / self-presentational casuistical mimesis) for old-fashioned pairings (e.g. interiority / exteriority), predictably privileging in each case the exoteric factors, thereby verging away from true dialogue and occasionally lapsing into mono-maniacal disputes with philosophers and critics, especially Jacques Derrida, Edward Said, and Stanley Fish. Some readers may find such coruscation invigorating; others, perhaps not. In either case, *Milton's Secrecy and Philosophical Hermeneutics* will spark new debates about Milton's concernment with both esoteric and exoteric Renaissance / early-modern traditions.

Stephen B. Dobranski. *A Variorum Commentary on the Poems of John Milton*, Vol. 3: *Samson Agonistes*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2009. xviii + 502 pp. \$85.00. Review by REUBEN SANCHEZ, SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY.

In the “Preface” to the recently published variorum commentary on *Samson Agonistes*, P.J. Klemp points out that the Columbia University Press Milton Variorum began as early as 1949, with three of the projected six volumes eventually published between 1970 and 1975: one on the Latin, Greek, and Italian poems, one on the minor English poems, and one on *Paradise Regained*. The project was discontinued at about that time due to the deaths of some of the editors associated with it: Merritt Y. Hughes, William Riley Parker, James E. Shaw, and A.S.P. Woodhouse. Except for John Steadman, there was not enough interest from other Miltonists to continue the project. The late Albert Labriola took up the cause and, in 1997, secured “permission” for Duquesne University Press to continue the Milton Variorum, though Klemp does not make clear exactly why permission was required.

Of course, permission could not have been related to copyright concerns regarding the commentary itself, since no press owns the commentary that would appear in a variorum. Klemp seems to suggest that permission had to do with the partial work done on the typescripts, introductions, and annotations to *PL* and *SA* by the Columbia editors, but the current editors would surely want to compose their own introductions and annotations. Besides, “permission” in this regard would only make sense if Duquesne had in mind updates of the three volumes Columbia published (and Duquesne has such updates in mind), so why would permission be required for anything related to *PL* and *SA*? There is nothing in Stephen B. Dobranski’s “A Note on the Annotations” that indicates he is relying on or completing the work of earlier editors. Nor is there anything in this volume that indicates the Milton Variorum is a joint venture between Columbia and Duquesne. In a parenthetical statement, Klemp cites the cutoff date for the variorum commentary on *SA* as 1970 because that was “when the Columbia University Press volumes started to appear” (xiii). Did Labriola therefore receive permission to publish three volumes of the Milton Variorum (and later to update the three existing vol-

umes) *only* if Duquesne adhered to a cutoff date of 1970, the time in which the Columbia volumes began to appear? If in fact that were the condition, the deal should have been immediately rejected. Perhaps on a related note, one can't help but wonder if the 1970 cutoff date was held more manageable by the current editors, instead of, say, a cutoff date closer to the actual date of publication (which clearly would have taken much more time, most likely far exceeding 2009). Did the editors who agreed to participate believe, therefore, that they could complete the project within a reasonable amount of time, and was that their reason for signing on to the project?

Whatever the reason for it, the 1970 cutoff date is a disappointment because it means that this variorum commentary intentionally excludes the last forty years of *SA* scholarship. Milton's poem is at least three-hundred and forty years old; without a doubt, the most useful and interesting *SA* scholarship has been generated over the last forty years. Nor does Klemp's promise that Duquesne will eventually update this volume seem comforting: "After we have completed a *Variorum Commentary* on *Samson Agonistes* and *Paradise Lost*, we will turn to an even more ambitious project, updating the entire *Variorum Commentary*—on the shorter English poems, Latin and Greek poems, Italian poems, *Paradise Lost*, *Paradise Regained*, and *Samson Agonistes*—to cover scholarship published from 1970 to 2000" (xv). This means that only after the remaining volumes (both on *PL*), also subject to the 1970 cutoff date, have been published will Duquesne begin to update all six volumes. Even then, the update for each volume will stop at 2000—followed, presumably, by yet another update. Clearly, it will be a very long time before the Milton *Variorum* will be complete and up to date.

There are Miltonists, however, who not only approve of but also prefer the 1970 cutoff date. In a recent review of the variorum commentary on *SA*, for example, David V. Urban regards the cutoff date as positive, and implies that to have gone beyond 1970 would have been unwise. Indeed, because of the recent post-9-11 reassessments of Samson's actions and motivations, Urban believes that "perhaps the most valuable aspect of Dobranski's volume is its 1970 cutoff point. This gives his audience the opportunity to step back from present controversies and to both examine the issues that were prominent in



earlier periods and ponder their significance for more recent critical concerns” (*RES*, Feb. 2010, 145). This seems an odd assertion for, as earlier noted, the best scholarship on *SA* has come about in the last forty years, and even if some of the scholarship since 9-11 is considered controversial, should that justify stepping back from it? I would contend, rather, that such “controversies” make Milton’s poem all the more relevant hundreds of years after its composition. But there is another reason why Urban considers the 1970 cutoff date fortuitous, because that marks the period when scholars began to question the argument for regeneration in *SA*. According to Urban, after 1970 there was no longer a consensus on this issue. Perhaps so, but regeneration nonetheless remained relevant after 1970, as evidenced even by those who would argue against it in lieu of some other interpretive line: All the more reason to consider such points of contention in a variorum commentary on *SA*. Yet, we can now “step back” and not have to deal with “controversies” endemic to post-1970 approaches to Milton; anyway, pre-1970 scholarship deals “with matters ostensibly quite different from, but ultimately not removed from, our current controversies” (146). As I take it, this means that pre-1970 scholarship on *SA* does not deal *directly* with the points of contention surrounding such issues as regeneration and 9-11, but does *foreshadow* them. Urban adds that pre-1970 scholarship represents the so-called “traditionalist” approach, challenged in post-1970 scholarship by John Carey’s *Milton* (1969), Irene Samuel’s “*Samson Agonistes* as Tragedy” (1970), and Joseph Wittreich’s *Interpreting Samson Agonistes* (1986). This is more than a tacit acknowledgment of the significance of such scholarship to our developing, our changing, understanding of Milton’s poem. Never mind the critiques of Wittreich’s arguments that followed publication of his book; he, along with Carey and Samuel, got Miltonists thinking about and writing about important issues in *SA*.

To that list of influential post-1970 scholarship, we can certainly add Barbara K. Lewalski’s “*Samson Agonistes* and the ‘Tragedy’ of the Apocalypse” (1970, reference to which is included in this variorum), Balachandra Rajan’s *The Prison and the Pinnacle* (1973), Mary Ann Radzinowicz’s *Toward “Samson Agonistes”* (1978), Joan S. Bennett’s *Reviving Liberty* (1989), Ashraf H.A. Rushdy’s *The Empty Garden* (1992), Laura Lunger Knoppers’ *Historicizing Milton* (1994), Derek

N.C. Wood's *Exiled from Light* (2001), Stephen M. Fallon's *Peculiar Grace* (2007), Noam Reisner's *Milton and the Ineffable* (2009)—there is simply too much scholarship for the editor of this variorum commentary to have left out. We must consider, as well, that settling on a 1970 cutoff date necessarily precludes from consideration the recent “Why Milton Matters” debate (in conference and in print) between Stanley Fish, Lewalski, and Wittreich—including Wittreich's 2006 book of the same title. While that debate had more to do with what it means to be a humanist these days, some of the issues these scholars debated would be germane to a commentary on *SA*. Finally, we must also consider that in the post-1970 period *Milton Quarterly* and *Milton Studies* became central to the development of the business of studying Milton in general and, for our purposes, *SA* in particular.

Those who do feel that the cutoff date adopted by the editors of the Milton Variorum is appropriate, might nonetheless acknowledge the drawback of not considering post-1970 scholarship in a book published in 2009. A variorum commentary should be useful to the contemporary reader. The primary target audience for this variorum would be scholars who have a personal and professional interest in *SA*, undergraduate and graduate students doing work on the poem, and Ph.D. candidates working on dissertations: An audience that wants to know about commentary reaching back hundreds of years, but also wants to know about recent commentary, for such material becomes part of the developing tradition, and therefore part of the Milton dialogue. Locating one's own contribution in the vast body of work on *SA* becomes problematic if the variorum is not up to date. How can one use a variorum as a way by which to engage tradition if that variorum intentionally stops compiling information four decades before the date of publication?

Lost in all this are Dobranski's annotations. He expertly presents a good selection of *SA* commentary, and while he also includes a “Works Cited” section, this variorum would have benefitted from the inclusion of a substantial index, or better yet, substantial indices. An excellent model to have followed in this regard would have been the Donne Variorum. Most scholars and students use a variorum as they would an encyclopedia or a dictionary: Consulting it for information from time to time as a research tool. Indices would make those ef-

forts a bit more manageable. As we know, the editor of a variorum must make choices about what to include or exclude as regards annotations. Dobranski's choices are fair and relevant, the manner in which he presents his annotations clear and effective. But in his essay, "Interpreting the Variorum," Fish argued years ago that it isn't *what* the editor presents, necessarily, but rather that the editor presents a fair selection of different interpretations. Fish cautioned us to keep in mind that the interpretive disagreements are "problems that apparently cannot be solved, at least not by the methods traditionally brought to bear on them. What I would like to argue is that they are not *meant* to be solved, but to be experienced (they signify), and that consequently any procedure that attempts to determine which of a number of readings is correct will necessarily fail" ("Interpreting," 465). By those standards, Dobranski succeeds in the manner in which he presents his annotations. But by those same standards, Archie Burnett fails in the manner in which he presents his introduction to this variorum: He attempts to present his own *correct readings*, while designating other readings with which he disagrees as *incorrect*. In doing so, he doesn't prepare the reader for the annotations; furthermore, he raises issues related to the problem of the 1970 cutoff date. Hence, I should like to take a closer look at Burnett's "Introduction" (1-46), which is neither objective nor neutral, as he readily admits in what seems a disclaimer: "This introduction aims to give an outline of the principal critical debates, and, rather than merely summarize the contents of everything published on the poem up to this volume's cutoff date of 1970, to do so selectively and critically, highlighting key developments, weighing up evidence, and forming judgments" (1). But since this is a variorum, and since there *are* judgments to be made, they should be made by the reader; in other words, the annotations should speak for themselves.

In the section "Characters" (14-32), Burnett not only disagrees with but also dismisses the regeneration line of argument (28-30). But because the anti-regeneration line of argument is more characteristic of post-1970 scholarship, one must question the decision to raise this point of contention in the first place (since it cannot be addressed in the annotations). He then defends Dr. Johnson, who was rightly confronted by twentieth-century scholars for declaring that *SA* "must

be allowed to want a Middle, since nothing passes between the first Act and the last that either hastens or delays the Death of *Samson*" (quoted in Burnett's introduction, 31). Burnett criticizes those who disagree with Johnson, and cites those who defend him, among them Christopher Ricks (from a work published in 1970). But the quote from Ricks that Burnett presents is far too long and left to stand on its own—intentionally so, as he declares, parenthetically, that Ricks "has not been answered" (32). Wouldn't that be a conclusion, one must ask, that the reader of this variorum should make *after* consideration of the relevant (post-1970) commentary? I believe Ricks, Johnson, and, by extension, Burnett have been answered—if not directly by name, then indirectly by issue—in post-1970 scholarship.

On the issue of whether Milton is Samson, Burnett summarizes both sides in "Interpretation" (39-45): Yes, Milton and Samson are alike; no, they are not alike because *SA* is a work of art. Burnett clearly prefers the latter, but such a stand does not seem necessary to a variorum introduction—particularly if that variorum does not consider the time period in which scholars have most forcefully addressed issues Burnett raises. In this same section, further, Burnett attacks twentieth-century critics who argue that the poem can be read as political allegory (41-42). Of course, this might be directed at critics working in the early to mid-twentieth-century, critics who are too dependant on a psychological interpretation to explain "events in the poem" (42). But if Burnett also infers critics working in the last thirty years of the twentieth-century, one can thus offer William Kerrigan's *The Sacred Complex* (perhaps the only book-length study of Milton, and of *Paradise Lost* in particular, that strongly relies on the psychoanalytic approach) as a counter to Burnett's dismissal of the psychological interpretation. As with Wittreich, it doesn't matter if one agrees with Kerrigan: Rather, his provocative arguments should be taken seriously and confronted. Of the psychological approach, Burnett concludes: "Prevaricating, vacillating, and disclaiming feature tellingly in the conjectural interpretations.... And yet such interpretations, so hedged or not, emerge as overdefined and overconfidently asserted" (43). Surely, such labored assaults in an introduction to a variorum commentary are indecorous.

As he winds down “Interpretation,” Burnett declares: “[T]he range of partialities, inconclusiveness, and kaleidoscopic transmutations of the autobiographical, allegorical, and political, and the psychological interpretations may be seen as indicating that Milton’s own experience is not so much reflected in *SA* as refracted through it; that the poet’s life, circumstances, and outlook can yield no more than flitting adumbrations of the poem” (43). Burnett’s relegation of the interpretations with which he disagrees to, among other things, “flitting adumbrations” is unreasonable and inaccurate, for such interpretations actually comprise substantial theories and methodologies that have helped invigorate Milton studies over the last forty years—perhaps even rescued Milton studies from the type of scholarship that characterized early- to mid- twentieth-century approaches to Milton. The new criticism and the history of ideas, after all, resulted in such texts as Hughes’ *The Complete Poetry and Major Prose of John Milton*, a text that at one time may have seemed an example of cutting-edge commentary, but now may serve more as a way by which to gauge how much literary theory and literary analysis have changed, a text that nonetheless has somehow remained in print, though it is difficult to believe any Miltonist still actually uses a classroom text originally published in 1957, then revised and reissued in 1962. How far Milton studies has come since 1962 is perhaps one of the foremost reasons the 1970 cutoff date is so troublesome.

Burnett’s introduction calls attention to itself for the wrong reasons, and it thereby detracts from Dobranski’s fine annotations: Despite Burnett’s disclaimer, his introduction does not prepare the reader for what a variorum commentary aims to accomplish, and it raises issues significantly addressed after the cutoff date. But even if one feels that the writer of an introduction to a variorum commentary can and should argue, can and should take sides, can and should call those with whom he disagrees prevaricators, vacillators, and disclaimers, one might nonetheless concede that Burnett does not give those whom he derides their due, because by the very nature of his introduction (broken down into several short sections) he does not have the time nor the space to be equitable to those with whom he disagrees.

Since this review has primarily concerned itself with that which is extra-textual to Dobranski's annotations, it might be apropos to conclude with yet another reference to a variorum review. In a Review Essay on the Donne Variorum, W. Speed Hill suggests that the goal of a variorum should be "accuracy, completeness, and consistency" (*HLQ*, 62.3 & 4, 450). He suggests, further, that the work in a variorum should not have to be done again (451). And like Fish, Hill believes that the uncritical character of a variorum results in uncertainty because different readings are presented. However, Hill seems to infer that, because of the uncertainty, the more up-to-date the variorum, the more confusing for the reader: "But chronology, the default principle of its [a variorum commentary's] ordering, confounds intellectual coherence: the closer we come to the present, the further away from 'truth' we seem to be, and to extrapolate where the future might lie ... from a plot of the current date points is a chimera" (453-54). I suspect that Hill, and Fish, would rather be further from the truth than closer. This is why, in a variorum commentary, we should try to get as close to the "present" as possible.

Louis Schwartz. *Milton and Maternal Mortality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. xi + 269 pp. \$90. Review by KATHRYN R. MCPHERSON, UTAH VALLEY UNIVERSITY.

Louis Schwartz's *Milton and Maternal Mortality*, a study of John Milton's poetic exploration of the material, cultural, and gendered dimensions of childbed in the early modern period, carefully reads both the major and minor poems to reveal how "Milton struggled to identify the proper theological function of the suffering many women experienced in childbirth" (4). Its wide survey of Milton's works, contextualized anew through maternal suffering, offers scholars and students fresh insights into the struggles underlying great poetry and how they might resemble those experienced by "great-bellied" women. Focusing on balanced socio-historical research, Schwartz offers detailed readings of "An Epitaph on the Marchioness of Winchester," "On Shakespear," *A Mask* [*Comus*], Sonnet 23, and *Paradise Lost*. *Milton and Maternal Mortality* thus builds a convincing case that the blind regi-

cide wrestled with the literary and cultural dimensions of catastrophic childbirth throughout his poetic career. Blending the biographical (i.e., the deaths of Milton's wives Mary Powell and Katherine Woodcock from complications following the births of their children) with the literary, Schwartz sets out to "gain access, imaginatively and intellectually, to the childbirth experiences of . . . women like them in the early years of the seventeenth century, providing for the first time a comprehensive and historically informed gloss on Milton's scattered but purposeful allusions to childbed suffering, and demonstrating the impact that such suffering had on his imagination" (6). Arguing from a nuanced understanding of feminism, Milton studies, and cultural history, Schwartz's study offers a lively treatment of how Milton's poetic evolution, one marked by awareness of the "conscious terrors" (259) of creativity, mirrors women's fraught birthing experiences.

In the book's first section, Schwartz contextualizes early modern childbirth, particularly detailing reproductive trauma in the middle decades of the seventeenth century. Drawing on a wide-ranging set of examples from early modern women's diaries, memoirs, and prayers, as well as male-authored devotional texts of the period and twentieth-century studies of early modern obstetrics (particularly David Cressy and Adrian Wilson), Schwartz outlines how women worked inside a divinely ordained framework of fear, pain, and grace in order to transform a potentially terrifying experience, one inextricably linked to Eve's sin. He asserts childbirth became construed as "a chance for women, in imitation of Christ, to redeem some small part of the world by exposing herself to pain and death in the name of her child, of human posterity as a whole, and especially in fulfillment of God's command" (71). His analysis claims that each birth "was nothing less than a key event in the ongoing maintenance of the cosmic and social fabric of creation, commonwealth, and family" (71). Schwartz's conclusions about maternity hold together well, grounded in his comprehensive survey of the social and theological underpinnings of the period.

Following this sensitively construed historical context, Schwartz illustrates the extent of Milton's poetic exploration of female suffering, a suffering that became allied with Milton's own generative process of writing. For instance, the brief and sometimes over-wrought discus-

sion of “On Shakespear” reveals how Milton interprets Shakespeare’s works as “impregnat[ing] the imaginations of his readers, but also caus[ing] the deaths of their imaginations, making them give birth—in the Platonic sense—to so many progeny. . . that ‘fancy’ itself ultimately dies in the process” (79). When Schwartz comes to a more grounded analysis of Milton’s use of the funeral elegy, however, he shows how the poet powerfully, although incompletely, adapts the genre as used by Ben Jonson and Michael Drayton in order to find ways of recuperating what most poets simply elided: women’s suffering and death while giving life.

Schwartz’s most fascinating arguments appear in the lengthy Chapter 7, “‘The wide wound and the veil’: Sonnet 23 and the ‘birth’ of Eve in *Paradise Lost*,” which links the complexities of Sonnet 23 with the thematic and poetic achievements of Milton’s magnum opus. By questioning “the problem of ‘which wife’” (157) and debates over the Churching of Women in “Methought I saw my late espoused Saint,” Schwartz carefully surveys debates about the “nexus of autobiography, theology and poesis” (169) in the poem. His cogent conclusion asserts that the sonnet’s ambiguous consolation points towards the intertwined narratives of Eve’s creation, believably connected with the particulars of early modern childbirth, in Books Four and Eight of *Paradise Lost*. He claims that the uncertain comfort provided by the sonnet ultimately indicates the epic’s own “peculiar blend of hopefulness and sorrow” (210).

Schwartz elaborates on these themes by plausibly connecting them with the concept of *imitatio Christi* that pervades much of *Paradise Lost*. For example, Chapter 8 compellingly explores Sin’s terrifying narrative of Death’s tortuous birth, showing the gendered suffering (both male and female) inherent in childbirth and how Milton “recognizes the centrality of childbirth in working out the consoling plan of providence” (234). The book’s final chapter also succeeds, although less fully, to argue the overarching recurrence of maternal imagery in Milton’s overall cosmology, including God’s generative creation, the violent birth of Pandaemonium, and the descriptions of Chaos as a reproductive space.

On the whole, *Milton and Maternal Mortality* imaginatively fuses disparate discourses to reveal how John Milton’s career-long allusion



to childbed suffering “invites us to see the suffering that attends the process of reproduction in the wake of original sin as a circumscribed, through terrifying, realm of disorder over which God gave the human mind and spirit dominion” (260). In addition to being a formidable scholarly study that every academic library should purchase, *Milton and Maternal Mortality*, featuring Schwartz’s personable voice, makes suitable reading for advanced undergraduates interested in women’s studies, early modern studies, or Milton’s poetry. Feminists and Miltonists (and especially those of us who are both) should welcome his sweeping survey of how Milton the man lived and Milton the poet created in a world quietly suffused with respect for women’s sacrifice.

Kevin Curran. *Marriage, Performance, and Politics at the Jacobean Court*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009. ix + 187 pp. \$99.95. Review by M. L. STAPLETON, INDIANA UNIVERSITY-PURDUE UNIVERSITY, FORT WAYNE.

This study analyzes the six wedding masques written by Jonson, Campion, Chapman, and Beaumont and performed at court during the first decade of the reign of James I. This somewhat new genre flourished as a type of Jacobean royal entertainment as it had not during Elizabeth’s time because marriage was, for her, an uncomfortable subject for somewhat obvious reasons, as it would not be for her successor for causes less apparent to us. The king was at some times happily married to his Danish queen, Anna, and thus clearly not opposed to the institution itself. He also saw that such masques were a medium through which he could express the idea of union, political as well as social and marital. Curran contends that since these pageants were hardly dull, insipid affairs and seem to have enacted some of the very conflicts that must have riled the court, they should “encourage us to think about monarchical rhetoric as a system of representation that was changeable, invented, and very often contested, not as something static, inherited, and reproduced” (5). Here, his focus is on “verbal rhetoric,” an exploration of the diction and ideas embedded in the texts that can be linked to concrete political ideas, in opposition to new historicist readings of ideologies allegedly underlying them.

Curran's Introduction provides the requisite critical background for the nonspecialist reader as well as the necessary reasons for pursuing the subject in monograph form. The first chapter explores the ways that marriage entertainments such as *The Masque of Blackness* helped James create a rhetoric of national union, since there was no pre-established model. Jonson's first three court masques, perhaps even more than the expected proclamations and speeches, reflect the "representational challenges" that the king and his faction faced in their quest for legitimacy. Chapter 2, "Erotic Policy," discusses the two Anglo-Scottish marriage celebrations in 1607-08, especially how "eroticism emerges as a key concept within the language of union" (58) in the masques by Jonson and Campion for these occasions that actually reinforced a positive image of British nationhood associated with James. Curran also speculates that this frank language of marital sexuality called attention to the rift between king and queen, since they had ceased to co-habit as man and wife during this time. The third chapter, devoted to the wedding entertainments for Princess Elizabeth and Frederick, the Elector Palatine, is potentially the most important, since this would be closest to the king himself, and the representational machinery would naturally connect the emerging idea of Britishness to the role of the new kingdom in the larger arena of European affairs, the Thirty Years' War on the horizon at decade's end. The concluding section of *Marriage, Performance, and Politics*, "Relocating Monarchical Rhetoric: The Entertainments for Robert Carr and Frances Howard," touches on the material that would probably be most familiar to those with some knowledge of Jacobean political and social intrigue, yet studiously avoids engaging in it, namely, the couple's role in the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, their nine public trials (without convictions), and their eventual loss of royal favor and subsequent financial ruin. The rather imposing monument in the background is David Lindley's excellent *The Trials of Frances Howard* (1993), which expertly situates the alleged murderess in her social, religious, sexual, and literary milieux and deconstructs her archetypal role as femme fatale.

The book is handsomely researched, written, documented, and organized, so there is not much to complain about. The curmudgeonly reader may wonder why James's bisexuality receives little or no men-

tion, since it was hardly a secret to his courtiers or the dramatists who made the pageants to entertain them that are so nicely analyzed in these pages. Also, the comment in the brief Afterword, that there are no “fully satisfactory explanations” (161) for the disappearance of the court wedding masque after the elaborate entertainments for the Howard-Carr marriage, is certainly a sound one, but another line of inquiry might have proven useful. Though Curran rightly wishes to avoid his predecessors’ sometimes facile tendency to read these pieces as prologue to the Overbury poisoning, is it not possible that the decline of this type of multiplex performance was somewhat related to this scandalous crime, the genre tainted as it were by association? The medium by which a monarch had so elaborately feted a favorite and his bride, who then in turn embarrassed him by their involvement in premeditated murder of one of his courtiers, could not have been one that he would have happily or willingly resurrected for future nuptials. Although this is not an exact analogy, the violent Hollywood action movie, with its exploding buildings, demonic terrorists, and graphic mayhem, disappeared almost completely as a genre for two years or so after the events of 11 September 2001. No one wanted to see violent death onscreen and several productions were brought to a halt for this reason, albeit the resurgence of this type of film was inevitable. The prospect of further elaborate wedding masques, even for his last favorite, George Villiers, eventually Duke of Buckingham, may have seemed distasteful indeed to an insecure and brokenhearted king, perhaps reminding him of time, money, and love lost on a dimwitted protégé and his perfidious spouse who repaid his generosity with monstrous ingratitude. Still, Curran negotiates the uneven terrain comprising literary analysis, social history, and theater-performance studies very well, sensibly focusing on the masques themselves in his attempt to make them living texts for us.

Jeffrey Theis. *Writing the Forest in Early Modern England: A Sylvan Pastoral Nation*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2009. xv + 368 pp. + 5 illus. \$60.00. Review by DONOVAN SHERMAN, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE.

A passage midway into Jeffrey Theis's *Writing the Forest in Early Modern England* poetically exemplifies its broader contention that early modern literary and cultural studies elides the palpable presence of the forest. Traditional readings of Shakespeare, Theis begins, "never get to the heart of the forest itself; its material, symbolic, and theatrical qualities invite but then reject any clarifying and unifying vision;" as a result, like "*Macbeth's* Birnam Wood, Shakespeare's forests are a moving target" (95). The passage acts as an encapsulating manifesto for the book as a whole, which seeks to hit the moving target of the forest, in all its mercurial and slippery incarnations, as a literal and figurative force of nature in constant dialogue with culture. Theis attempts to remedy scholarship's verdant myopia by coining its titular term, "sylvan pastoral," which operates as a twofold construct: first, as a historical gateway to help illuminate how forest policy in early modernity shapes the literature; and second, as a theoretical framework that complicates the foundations of interpretation itself, an always-excessive presence that blurs the legibility of its contours. He is strongest when these two aims are balanced, which, unfortunately, occurs only occasionally and on a small scale, rather than on the fundamental level suggested by Theis's provocative arguments; the broad critical overhaul that the sylvan pastoral demands becomes lost amidst a web of vague assertions, repetitions, and contradictions. What results from this inconsistency is an infidelity to the very aims Theis proposes; while several close readings offer scholarly interest, the heart of the forest remains largely undiscovered.

*Writing the Forest* is structured around readings of texts that move roughly chronologically, starting with the Shakespearean era, moving through the civil war, and ending in the Restoration. First, however, Theis offers an introduction to structure his claims. This section reveals refreshing, at times radical, theses on the sylvan pastoral, but it also establishes the book's contradictory theoretical foundations. In elucidating his concerns, Theis distinguishes the sylvan pastoral from

the pastoral genre as a whole, along with its critics; he claims that the influential pastoral scholar Paul Alpers “largely discounts nature as a genuine focus of pastoral,” whereas “sylvan pastoral brings nature to the foreground as the tangled topography of the wood demands the attention of pastoral characters.” Immediately following this intriguing statement, however, Theis notes that, as opposed to the shepherds that Alpers studies, the essence of sylvan pastoral’s characters “dialectically evolves out of their attempt to create a place for themselves in the wood” (25). The language subtly shifts the focus from nature—the topic supposedly ignored by Alpers—back to human beings, whose transformations and placements are the real emphasis. In other words, Theis maintains human exceptionalism even as he asserts that nature should be given primacy. This maneuver—the privileging of the human, while simultaneously gesturing toward a new hermeneutics of nature—is indicative of a larger pattern; elsewhere, Theis states that definitions of the forest offer “contrasting ideas about one’s place in nature, and how that position either facilitates or diminishes *the individual’s and his or her culture’s* capacity to change” (42, emphasis mine). The human, not the forest, remains the “genuine focus.” At times he attempts to move beyond a human-based dialectic, as when he notes that throughout “Western history, nature and culture have been seen in a dialectical opposition with each influencing the other, but too often critics neglect that English forests are not opposed to culture and civilization” (28). Here, contradicting his earlier claim about Alpers’s pastoral characters, sylvan pastoral in fact seems to erase the dialectical boundaries of humanity and nature; as such, it appears aligned with the post-humanist theory of critics such as Donna Haraway, Michel Serres, and, in early modern studies specifically, Laurie Shannon and Julian Yates, which proposes the inseparability of humans from their environment. Yet for every attempt to erase this boundary, there are several more to reify it, retreating to a Hegelian interpretation of human-centered change, as when he describes social and natural worlds “dialectically engaging each other so that society cannot be realized without the forest” (94). Is the relationship of humanity to nature, in sylvan pastoral, dialectical or not? Actually bringing nature to the foreground would propose a new typology of nature-based criticism; while this task is enormously ambitious, it is

the task Theis has given himself. An opportunity to propose a new interpretative scheme is lost in favor of vagueness with a veneer of critical invigoration.

Once the chapters proper begin, the book is on much surer footing, coupling close readings with fascinating historical research. While the inconsistencies of the introduction still obfuscate the larger aims of these critiques, they individually offer more modest, but nonetheless well-researched and productive, interventions. The first section contains chapters on Shakespearean plays, *As You Like It*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, and *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. The first of these finds surprising resonance between the migration of the court to the forest and larger historical patterns of migration in the period. Furthermore, by suggesting that the woods, like the stage, operate as a dynamic site of role-playing and subjective change, Theis traces interdisciplinary connections between performance studies and nature criticism. *A Midsummer Night's Dream* provides an especially apposite area for examination, and Theis is particularly acute in noting that all "places of human and fairy habitation that might carve out an ordered, protective space within the forest are displaced just outside the forest the audience sees" (115), once again conjoining theatrical and fantastical space. A reading of *Merry Wives* supplies the strongest entry in the book by studying the practice of poaching as both material fact and metaphor of iconoclasm and liminality; details of greyhound permits and forest rights legislation texture the play's characters and illuminate new narrative currents, although one wishes Theis pursued the tossed-off observation that a lustful Falstaff allows "distinctions between man and animal" to "collapse as lust makes transgression possible" (143). All in all, a rethinking of the forest in Shakespeare as a forest is an elegant intervention on extant discourses.

The following sections survey poetry that, Theis asserts, registers the "trauma" of the civil war in the vocabulary of sylvan pastoral. Centering on the ambivalence of tree imagery, specifically, Theis notes that "sylvan pastoral decentralizes the currency of the royal oak to diffuse its literary, economic, and ideological value across the broader forest of the nation" (159). This decentralization leads to the appropriation of arboreal imagery by writers as varied as the political radical Gerrard Winstanley, the poet Andrew Marvell, and the novel-

ist and historiographer James Howell. The trees these writers deploy, Theis argues, are both signals of the era's actual forestry policy and ambivalent royal symbols, suggesting both the natural agency and ideological weakness of the monarchy. As with his chapters on Shakespeare, Theis is strongest here when he focuses his critique, as with his treatment of Marvell's "Upon Appleton House" as a reclamation of the pastoral genre from a territory of Horatian peace to an unsettled environment charged with specters of war. The section closes with a consideration of John Evelyn's *Sylva*, a "polymorphous work" whose instability reflects sacral and economic tensions of the forest's iconicity: "In one moment Evelyn depicts the English woodland as a sacred grove, set apart from a corrupt world, and in another moment he lists myriad secular uses of timber products" (238). While the sylvan pastoral might seem to be the last place to see symptoms of war's damage, Theis persuasively argues, it in fact captures the ripples of horror with uncanny power.

The final section, on Milton, rehearses many of the ideas found earlier in the book, and is generally stronger in reading *A Mask Presented at Ludlow Castle* than contending with *Paradise Lost*; the latter seems to overpower Theis's strategies and demand a larger engagement with its sylvan qualities. While capable of lovely turns of phrase, as when he notes that Milton's pastoral is "a blueprint of engagement with the world" (259), several subsections hobble the main thrust of his argument, notably an unsubstantiated digression on the multiple uses of the word "purlieu." While the briefness of Theis's treatment of the *Paradise Lost* seems an odd note to end his work on, it also seems endemic of *Writing the Forest's* ambition, which attempts to limn a theoretical terrain even as it defines it. This automorphic quality provides much of the book's propulsive energy, but also comprises of its structural limitations. While individual chapters can provide helpful interlocutors for scholars of the works under discussion, or nature critics in general, the book as a whole too often seems a victim of the myriad complications essential to the definition of its subject. As with the confounding properties of the sylvan pastoral itself, it seems that efforts to map anew a particularly tangled thicket of cultural texts can leave the reader feeling somewhat lost and occa-

sionally frustrated—albeit with an ineffable sense of having absorbed something significant.

Ernest Gilman. *Plague Writing in Early Modern England*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009. xi + 256 pp. index. bibl. \$35.00. Review by JOHN GIBBS.

Bubonic plague's endemicity in early modern England placed London at perpetual risk of epidemic. In the seventeenth century, the plague appeared annually but with minimal impact in the City and its liberties. However, in 1603, 1625 and 1665, London's Weekly Bill of Mortality did record the minimum of forty plague deaths the city government required to recognize plague as an epidemic. Epidemics generated a tremendous amount of print matter—broadsides, religious and medical tracts, satire and philosophy—all a part of the plague discourse ostensibly designed to help its residents recognize, interpret and survive the epidemic. In *Plague Writing in Early Modern England*, Ernest Gilman examines the matrix of such texts actively engaged in constructing the dominant ideology of plague in seventeenth-century England before adroitly engaging modern trauma theory to re-imagine familiar works by Ben Jonson, John Donne, Samuel Pepys and Daniel Defoe as texts negotiating an unremitting cultural anxiety over the threat of epidemic.

Consequent to Reformation iconoclasm, early modern England was deprived of the popular rituals that reinforced plague's identity as a universal punishment, the severity and duration of which could be influenced by communal religious observation. Plague epidemic, Gilman contends, was thereafter an event bereft of ritual and defined almost exclusively by language. The cultural certainty and consolation provided by traditional religious ideology was replaced with a stark, analytical theodicy allied with the pragmatic and sometimes contradictory interpretations of an urban epidemic offered by the nascent medical establishment. The combined religious and medical plague discourse sanctioned by the State replaced coherency with enigma. "It would be increasingly difficult, and ultimately impossible," observes Gilman, "for most people to reconcile logically or theologically the



conflicting views of the plague as moral and infectious agent" (152). In the literary texts Gilman offers as evidence of this condition, plague constitutes the principle, repressed center around which these works are organized.

Gilman begins his analysis of literary texts with an extraordinary reading of Ben Jonson's poem "On My First Sonne," written in the epidemic year of 1603 when his seven-year-old son, Benjamin, died, as the book ably argues, of the plague. Flight from London during epidemic was a common, though controversial practice, frequently and popularly addressed in seventeenth-century plague tracts. The poet struggles with his grief and guilt of being safely beyond the reach of the disease (and his family) in Huntingdonshire at the home of Sir Robert Cotton when the child died. More significant to the reading of this poem is Gilman's presentation of Jonson's struggle with plague epidemic bereft of meaning, for there appears no adequate justification for the child's death contained in any of the formulations of epidemic as God's punishment for (whose?) sin. The three works by Donne that Gilman arranges to explain the prelate's (ultimate) textual production of plague show, not unexpectedly, no similar expression of confusion or doubt: *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions* (1624), the 1625 edition of the earlier *Anniversaries* of 1611 and 1612 and Donne's sole plague sermon ("arguably the finest of that dismal genre" [192]), delivered at St. Dunstan's on 15 January 1626. The first, Dr. Donne's meditation on illness and death, was composed following his recovery from "the spotted fever" not long before the epidemic of 1625. The second, an unauthorized edition appearing during the epidemic, was published by the opportunistic printer William Stansby, obviously to capitalize on the brisk market for advice, understanding and solace such texts might provide. The sermon was delivered as the epidemic waned in mid winter. Though the homily is the only text that is an immediate and obvious engagement of a specific epidemic experience, trauma theory provides a lexicon whereby we may discern a plague text in its silence and by omission. Broadly defined, "social trauma can result from a prolonged 'period of severe attenuation and erosion as well as from a sudden flash of fear'" (56). In this calculus, this sampling of Donne's works, intellectually provocative but ultimately consoling textual constructions of sickness, morbidity and death, exemplify

“an age and its literary production marked by the threat and reality of plague” (37).

Gilman continues his analysis of previously unrecovered literary negotiations of plague’s depredations with shorter readings of Pepys’s *Diary* and Defoe’s *Journal of the Plague* that reveal “an engagement with infectious disease that hovers between “the providential and the quotidian” (217). Indeed, Pepys’s *Diary* records his robust pursuit of both business and pleasure throughout the epidemic year of 1665. Tenuously yet intriguingly, Gilman interprets how Pepys, surrounded by the horrors of this experience, successfully represses such sustained trauma; we find it unconsciously subsumed and obliquely expressed in such subjects as his recounting of an erotic dream (“the best that ever was dreamed” [219]) and his delight with his increase in worth through successful business engagements. In the *Journal of the Plague Year* (1721), written for a reading public anxious over a contemporary epidemic in Marsailles, the record of Defoe’s narrator’s personal participation in London’s 1665 epidemic is neither private nor repressed, and, asserts Gilman, the stark sights and sounds of epidemic here illustrate the epistemological shift evident in the plague writing of the period that is part of a larger movement in the sciences, signaling “a changing relationship between metaphysics and epistemology” (234). The harrowing spectacle of the plague pit and the incessant wails of the dying and the grief-stricken, challenge the reader’s default explanation for the overwhelming suffering in plague time as providence—harder still to reconcile than it had been in 1603. What Defoe seems to be repressing in *Journal of the Plague Year* is, finally, unbelief.

*Plague Writing in Early Modern England* provides a lucid, learned and sophisticated answer to crucial and (thus far) ever-frustrating questions concerning the culture’s long-term relation to the plague phenomenon and the apparent and puzzling dearth of literary plague. “We have always known that plague was there,” Gilman states, “relentlessly taking its toll on England for more than three hundred years” (38). Now we have a much better idea of how to answer these questions.

Ryan J. Stark. *Rhetoric, Science, and Magic in Seventeenth-Century England*. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2009. vii + 234 pp. \$69.95. Review by JACOB A. CEDILLO TOOTALIAN, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN, MADISON.

In *Rhetoric, Science, and Magic in Seventeenth-Century England*, Ryan J. Stark recasts the Restoration shift toward an ideal of rhetorical plainness as an ontological, rather than a syntactical, event. Scholars since R. F. Jones have identified the new plain style as a phenomenon that manifested in sparse, unornamented language. However, attempts to define the structure of this rhetorical mode have been hindered by the apparent hypocrisy of plain texts that use “metaphorical styles to critique metaphorical styles” (2). Stark contends that, due to the inherently tropological nature of language, elaborate expressions necessarily persist in the plain writings of the late seventeenth century. However, these expressions lack the valences of meaning they once had. He suggests that a change occurred not in the choice or arrangement of words, but in how those words were understood to signify.

Turning the focus to a distinction in philosophies of language, Stark diffuses the critical impasse surrounding the new plain style by tracing the “paradigm shift from enchantment to plainness,” which he characterizes as the “most significant linguistic happening in seventeenth-century England” (3). His study underscores the contrast between plain expressions that only mark out representations and the turns of phrase “capable of transmogrifying reality and, in certain configurations, transporting audiences into metaphysical states of mind” (10). He locates the impetus for this disentanglement of words from things in an anxiety about the influence of diabolical rhetoric, an influence detected in the discourses of zealous religion and nefarious magic. Denying the users of enchanted language their ontological claim to power, experimentalist philosophers used the new plain style to ensure that language could not be turned to demonic purposes. The result was a disenchantment of the world that Stark laments. Grounding his study in a critique of the Enlightenment materialization of language, Stark seeks to undermine modern linguistic assumptions by revealing the moment in the history of rhetoric when language was stripped of its metaphysical force.

Chapter 1 articulates the challenge that rhetorical plainness posed to enchanted philosophies of language. Following earlier scholars, Stark figures Francis Bacon as the progenitor of the new plain style. Bacon's advancement of learning was underwritten by a rhetorical reaction against Renaissance mysticism, a reaction affirmed in later works of the new science like Daniel Sennert's *Chymistry Made Easie and Useful* (1619). By the second half of the seventeenth century, "a mainstream philosophical attitude toward rhetoric" (24) was emerging, which Stark defines using the views of Thomas Browne and Thomas Hobbes as foils. Experimentalist philosophers rejected both Browne's charmed philosophy of language and Hobbes' skeptical attitude toward spiritualism. Thus, the emergent rhetorical consensus discarded enchanted language while retaining a spiritual metaphysics. Stark argues that Joseph Glanvill, in revising *The Vanity of Dogmatizing* (1661) into *Scepsis scientifica* (1665), sought to conform to this point of agreement. Since the stylistic debate between R. F. Jones and Morris Croll in the early twentieth century, Glanvill's revision has been seen as an important component of the consolidation of the new plain style. Stark interprets Glanvill's omission of an example of rhetorical magic as a sign of his assent to plainness as a linguistic philosophy, as well as a style.

In Chapter 2, Stark emphasizes the institutionalization of the plain philosophy of language with the Royal Society's stylistic program. Acknowledging that experimentalist philosophers largely implemented the plain style reform—the crux of R. F. Jones' thesis—Stark asserts further that they were motivated by the need for a prophylactic against diabolical rhetoric. The most prominent work to make the case for the plain philosophy was Thomas Sprat's *The History of the Royal Society* (1667), which Stark defends against charges of hypocrisy on the grounds that it uses "plain tropes to challenge bewitching tropes" (51). John Locke also championed linguistic reform as a defense against demonic seduction in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) in which he argues that plain language serves as both the *tool* and the *proof* of human rationality. Under the influence of plain philosophers, Restoration poets adhered to a utilitarian sense of the imagination. Stark demonstrates that Abraham Cowley's "To the Royal Society" (1667) and Samuel Butler's *Hudibras* (1662-3) employ plain tropes

that contrast with the metaphysical conceits of earlier poetry like George Herbert's *The Temple* (1633). Concurring with Jones' assertion that the plain sensibility found wider circulation through preaching, Stark demonstrates that such Royal Society-affiliated bishops as John Wilkins, John Tillotson, and Gilbert Burnet helped turn the plain sensibility into the rhetorical plank of mainstream Anglicanism in its opposition to nonconformist zeal and Catholic transubstantiation.

In Chapter 3, Stark explores natural magic, the rhetorical domain of those "magicians, sages, and spiritualists" (9) who believed they derived their powers from the spiritual valences of nature. Stark undermines, on linguistic grounds, the argument put forth most famously by Frances Yates that Renaissance magic evolved *into* modern experimentalism. Emphasizing the debate surrounding the rhetoric of Rosicrucian sorcery, Stark shows that, rather than emerging from Rosicrucianism, the experimentalist philosophers reacted against the mystical movement's claims to linguistic magic. He insists that the plain philosophy of language was irreconcilable with the occult notion that "[r]hetoric is a cosmological architectonic" (96). Stark uses the controversy between Henry More and Thomas Vaughan to animate that point of conflict. While natural magicians insisted on the mundane essence of their power, the plain philosophy made their charms difficult to distinguish from witchcraft.

Chapter 4 examines the nature of diabolical rhetoric, delving into the body of witchcraft and demonology literature neglected by scholars unaware of its relevance to the history of rhetoric. Stark lays out a taxonomy of tropes associated with the inversions of demonic eloquence, especially irony and antithesis. The danger of the devil's language is that it comes in the guise of goodly words, so it takes a tropological and spiritual sensitivity to discern the morality of language. The rhetoric of those who assumed divine guidance outside of orthodox Church authority was seen as vulnerable to devilish bewitchment. Just as mainstream Anglicans viewed nonconformists with suspicion, Protestants more broadly saw Catholics as effectively compromised by witchcraft. Yet, despite the demonization of the Catholic priest, the commonplace figure of the witch remained female because her empowerment constituted a diabolical reversal of the early modern social order. Stark analyzes the demonic inversions

depicted in dramas like *Macbeth* and employed by Satan himself in *Paradise Lost*. The deceptive commiseration between humanity and Satan is based upon the false premise of a common state of fallenness, which Stark argues is belied by the Christian redemption of humankind. Thus, with the power of rhetorical training as a shield against demonic influence, experimentalist philosophers became “exorcists of an informal type” (145).

In Chapter 5, Stark introduces Meric Casaubon as an Interregnum precursor to the language reformers of the Royal Society. His *Treatise Concerning Enthusiasm* (1655), though syntactically unlike later plain writings, nonetheless advances the plain philosophy at the height of nonconformist zeal, affirming a set of values consonant with Anglican theology and the new science. Casaubon asserts that enthusiastic rhetoric threatens to mislead audiences and authors alike. The rejection of formal rhetorical training in pursuit of an intimate connection with God leaves believers without the rational mechanisms to guard against devilish deception. For those who understood the English Civil War as a conflict “promulgated by mass demonic possession” (152), bewitchment appears to endanger society at large. Stark also examines Casaubon’s preface to the spiritual diary of John Dee in a brief epilogue to the chapter.

Chapter 6 considers John Dryden, a figure more familiar to the rhetorical tradition and well-known for his rejection of the “idioms of Renaissance magic and mystery” (175). Stark extrapolates Dryden’s philosophy of rhetoric from such works as *Of Dramatic Poesy* (1668) and *Defense of the Epilogue* (1672), the prefaces to *Annus mirabilis* (1666) and *The Mock Astrologer* (1671), and his revisions of Shakespeare. Breaking from what he called “all those credulous and dotting ages” (176), Dryden employs plain versions of figures like ekphrasis and paronomasia, which Stark distinguishes from the metaphysical tropes of Richard Crashaw and George Herbert. With the rejection of enchanted language, tropes become nothing more than ornamental devices, and modern rhetoric is born.

Stark concludes the book with a brief statement on the import of his project. Seventeenth-century experimentalists reacted to the dangers of rhetorical bewitchment by creating “a philosophy of style, by which the esoteric could be talked about, but not invoked,

intimated, or otherwise involved” (204). Stark criticizes this reformulation of language from a “spiritually minded” (206) philosophical position that seeks to restore something of the charmed Renaissance worldview in order to affirm the possibility of spiritual rhetoric. He voices regret that

the truth of prayer and the truth of demonry ... fall by the wayside in the world of deism, the theological crescendo of the Enlightenment trajectory, which presupposes a material world, and which has as its most insidious rhetorical consequence the trapping of the human voice in a realm of dusty bric-a-brac, spokes and gears, linguistic rubble. (207)

Scholars sympathetic to materialism, skepticism, and deism will likely take issue with Stark’s critique of Enlightenment values. Yet, his critical perspective facilitates the book’s key insights into the nature of the plain philosophy and contributes to the liveliness of his prose. By marking this moment in the history of rhetoric, Stark hopes to prompt the reemergence of an enchanted sense of language “in new and timely configurations” (206). This is a welcome intervention, whether or not we find his particular agenda persuasive. Stark’s reconsideration of the shape of the rhetorical tradition in the seventeenth century draws attention to neglected bodies of literature and inspires productive questions about metaphysical rhetoric. In particular, his suggestive readings of *Macbeth*, *The Temple*, and *Paradise Lost* point up the inadequacy of modern theories of language to comprehend the signifying structures of the Renaissance. If the modern landscape is indeed dominated by linguistic rubble, then *Rhetoric, Science, and Magic in Seventeenth-Century England*, at the very least, encourages us to take a second look at the enchanted artifacts that remain.

Scott L. Newstok. *Quoting Death in Early Modern England: The Poetics of Epitaphs Beyond the Tomb*. New York: Palgrave, 2009. Xiv + 228 pp. + 13 illus. \$80.00. Review by GREG BENTLEY, MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY.

Individual and cultural responses to death were varied and numerous in early modern England, and the commentaries on death since then have been equally varied and numerous. So much so that the

topic itself seems almost dead. However, Scott L. Newstok's recent book breathes new life into the subject of death. In addition, who could have imagined that such a small container as the epitaph could hold so much? Clearly, Newstok did, and he reveals as much in his scholarly, yet immanently readable and often entertaining, study of this brief, but paradoxically expansive, literary genre. It is an admirably researched and thoroughly documented study. His list of References includes some 290 primary works and 357 secondary sources.

In the opening sentence of his introduction entitled "Introduction: Re-citing 'Epitaph' and 'Genre' in Early Modern England," Newstok forthrightly declares the topic and scope of his study: "*Here* is what this book is all about" (1). Three brief paragraphs later, he clearly and directly states the book's thesis: "The word 'here' serves as the common, even the *principal* declaration of an epitaph. This study holds that by attending to this epitaphic 'here' in the English Renaissance, by here-ing it back into the presence for which it yearns, one can discern some crucial patterns, related not only to the reformation of mortality, but also to the emergence of a novel, even 'reformed' sense of textualized memory" (1).

To reveal these patterns, Newstok employs a methodology appropriate to his subject. Passing on the obvious container/contained metaphor and deliberately rejecting the more contemporary conceit of "weaving," Newstok adopts the strategies of early modern antiquaries. As he says,

This study proceeds in much the same manner that these antiquaries did: assembling pebbles of texts, as it were, into an elaborate mosaic. Such an agglomerative procedure still has its virtues since it permits different perspectives on the mosaic; indeed, it even *encourages* that different mosaics be envisioned. Although this metaphorical mosaic inevitably reveals my own lapidary bias, it captures more accurately an early modern inclination (and mine as well) than a more recent conceit for scholarly argument—that of *weaving* (itself reinforced by the increasing prevalence of web-based research). Weaving implies threads; a mosaic implies more (apparently) autonomous pieces that, when gathered, create less of a whole cloth than aggregate image. (3-4)



In addition to methodology, Newstok uses the idea of a mosaic as a structural and stylistic strategy as well. Each chapter is broken into numerous small sections, and to each section he affixes an appropriate epitaphic inscription. For example, he divides chapter one, “‘Here lies’: Pointing to the ‘Graue Forme,’” a total of 24 pages, into 16 subsections, beginning with *Locus mortis* and ending with *Epi-topos*. As he assembles each piece, this part of the mosaic becomes clearer and clearer until we see how “[w]hat invigorates the epitaph is that it partakes in a mutual interplay between discourses more traditionally historical (a *materially*-bound response to death) and discourses more traditionally literary (a *textually*-based response to death). Locating the epitaph in this manner marks ground where the literal (the body right ‘here’) and the figurative (‘here’ involving representation) overlap” (45). Stylistically, the accumulation of such lapidary gems renders Newstok’s total mosaic clearly and vividly.

Newstok’s focus is at once historical and generic. His historical perspective is two-fold: theological and political. For example, he suggests how epitaphic production signals significant changes in theological practices and attitudes. First, the increase in the production of epitaphs during the sixteenth century stems from the often violent “convulsions of the theological environment in Tudor England and the more general trends towards public piety in post-Reformation culture” (17). Second, the dissolution of such institutional practices as annual masses and prayers for the dead “encouraged an individualistic turn” (19), and, third, “[t]he Protestant (increasingly secular) epitaph came to ‘reoccupy’ the space left by the disappearance of Purgatory” (24).

In terms of political history, chapter two “‘Turn thy Tombe into a Throne’: Elizabeth I’s Death Rehearsal,” addresses the complex motives behind and the varied responses to Elizabeth’s presentation of her own funeral inscription at her first public speech. Newstok’s purpose here is quite focused. As he says, he aims to articulate exactly how “her epitaph *functioned*, steering a middle course between the celebration of it by some critics and the denigration of it by others” (68). Newstok’s analysis of this unusual political act leads him, as he says, to make his “most extravagant claim” regarding it: “that Elizabeth imagining her own tombstone was in some sense a precursor

to the aggressively satirical publications of the 1640s, which saw the rise of epitaphs for composite fictional characters” (80).

This bold assertion marks Newstok’s transition from a historical to a generic perspective, and in the succeeding three chapters, he assembles the stones of his mosaic to reveal the epitaph’s place with regard to the hierarchical valuation between poetics and rhetoric, to the importance of epitaphs cited in dramatic works, and to the generic relationship between the epitaph and the elegy. These, for me, are the most striking and compacted chapters in the book. Chapter four, for instance, “‘Killing rhetoric’: The Poetics of *movere*,” focuses on “those elements that poetics derived from rhetoric that might incline a writer to invoke epitaphs as special examples of poetic expression” (117). In this chapter, Newstok imaginatively assembles three elements in particular: the rhetorical/poetic concept of “moving” along side of Renaissance representations of Amphion and Orpheus as agents of *movere*, in conjunction with the epitaph’s emphasis on this process. By clearly arranging and polishing his pieces, Newstok illustrates how “[f]or the early modern defenders of poetry, it was ‘moving’ that reached from one domain to the other, with the epitaph *consolidating* the attempt at ‘killing rhetoric’” (134). In chapter five, “‘An theater of mortality’: In Sincerity, Onstage,” Newstok discusses the place and function of epitaphs in theatrical productions with regard to the period’s notions of sincere and insincere discourse. As he says, “[g]iven that epitaphs and plays are perceived to occupy contrasting positions with respect to the contemporary discourse surrounding sincerity, it is notable how often epitaphs are invoked in the dramas of the period: the preeminently ‘sincere’ genre within the preeminently ‘insincere’ genre” (149). Newstok focuses specifically on Thomas Kyd’s *The Spanish Tragedy*, Cyril Tourneur’s *The Atheist’s Tragedy*, and several of Shakespeare’s plays.

In the last chapter entitled “‘Lapping-up of Matter’: Epitaphic Closure in Elegies,” Newstok draws together all his individual pieces to clearly and vividly render his complete mosaic. As he says, “it has been the contention throughout this study that what remains most intriguing about the early modern epitaph . . . is its re-citation. What is of interest is an examination of the epitaph not as a generic tradition unto itself but rather as a citational move within a whole range

of English Renaissance contexts... [T]he *placement* of these epitaphs matters and is almost invariably significant" (169).

In sum, to echo the voice of epitaph, "Here lies" a grave text, for it intelligently and imaginatively retextualizes the early modern period's memorialization of death. Pause a while, gentle reader, and examine it.

Richard Dutton. *Ben Jonson, Volpone, and the Gunpowder Plot*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. xiii + 179 pp. 19 illus. Review by ROBERT C. EVANS, AUBURN UNIVERSITY MONTGOMERY.

Richard Dutton's new book on Ben Jonson's *Volpone* instantly becomes one of the very first volumes that any serious student of the play must immediately consult. Dutton's long and extraordinarily productive career as a scholar of Jonson (and indeed of much else) makes this much-anticipated book especially important, particularly since he is writing about one of the most significant non-Shakespearean plays of the period. As Dutton himself notes early in the volume, *Volpone* "has, to the best of my knowledge, been included in every anthology of English Renaissance drama ever compiled" (1). Effective both on the page and on the stage, the play deserves the kind of close, probing attention Dutton gives it in this book, which is the product of many years of thought and research.

Dutton's basic argument is that Jonson's play reflects directly (if obliquely) on the events of the 1605 Gunpowder Plot, and that in particular the playwright seems to have taken subtle but satiric aim at the role of Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury and James I's chief minister, in that nearly explosive affair. Dutton gives special emphasis to the 1607 printing of the play and particularly to the prefatory matter to that edition—matter which is, indeed, completely reprinted in photographic reproduction in this book. Dutton shows that Cecil was widely disliked, particularly by Catholics (of whom Jonson was one), and he patiently builds his case that the play was probably meant to be taken (and certainly *could* have been taken) as theatrical mockery of Cecil. He shows why Jonson may have had various reasons, in addition to religious ones, to satirize such a powerful and influential man—a man, indeed, who often figured as one of Jonson's own patrons. Indeed,

Dutton even makes the intriguing argument that Cecil “had a track record of not deigning to respond to the great majority of personal abuse that he inevitably attracted” (9). In 1606 (Dutton suggests), Cecil and Jonson both needed each other to one degree or another, and so Jonson may have been able to get away with mocking such an undeniably powerful figure.

One of the most useful sections of Dutton’s book is its opening chapter, “Jonson’s life and the Epistle to *Volpone*,” which quickly and clearly lays out the relevant biographical background. In this chapter and elsewhere, Dutton demonstrates his wide and careful reading of previous scholarship and also explains where, why, and how he either agrees or disagrees with others’ conclusions. Here and throughout the book his tone is both judicious and generous, with often a touch of humor (as when he says of Jonson’s drama *Poetaster* that the “play has uncomplimentary things to say about lawyers, soldiers, and actors, as well as transparent lampoons of Marston and Dekker, so people were probably lining up to complain”). One is never at a loss to understand, in this book, why Dutton thinks as he does, nor is his prose style anything less than lucid. This is historical scholarship, and scholarly writing, the way they should be done.

Dutton always makes strong circumstantial cases to support his suggestions, as when he discusses the probable period of the composition of *Volpone* and how that composition may have been affected by current events and by contemporary texts, including one important text by Cecil himself. Particularly interesting is his discussion of the fact that passages from a letter Jonson wrote to Cecil “reappear verbatim in the Epistle to *Volpone*” (27). Meanwhile, his patient decoding of the commendatory poems that preface the play is typical of his painstaking methods of interpretation. Not only readers of Jonson will profit from consulting this book, so will readers of Donne, author of one of those commendatory poems; indeed, Dutton shows himself quite familiar with recent (and sometimes neglected) scholarship on any subject he touches. Inevitably, many of Dutton’s arguments must be highly speculative, given the nature of the surviving evidence, but his speculations never seem irresponsible.

One of the most interesting sections of the volume, for instance, concern Dutton’s suggestion that Sir Politic Would-be in the play is

modeled, at least in part, on the famous diplomat Sir Henry Wotton. As usual, Dutton makes his case with care, assembling all the relevant evidence and responding to any actual or potential objections. Meanwhile, the chapter on *Volpone* as a beast fable will interest even readers skeptical of topical interpretations of the play. As usual, Dutton concludes this chapter of the book with a clear summary of his arguments as well as an open acknowledgment of the difficulties those arguments present. This is his method throughout the book: he never simply takes his claims for granted. Indeed, whether or not one ultimately finds his arguments about the topical satire of the play convincing, the book is still worth reading for the many insights it provides about Jonson's life, his cultural circumstances, and his relations with other people, as in Dutton's discussion of Jonson's relations with John Florio. In the course of making his case, Dutton comments on practically every play by Jonson that preceded *Volpone*, and he also pays special attention to another play (*Catiline*) that was written later.

Dutton believes that *Volpone* reflects Jonson's distaste for what he probably perceived as "Cecil's exploitation of English society, undermining the law, alienating fathers and sons, and coming between husbands and wives, in (as it might be seen) the remorseless pursuit of his own wealth and gratification" (110). He argues that "the shady basis of *Volpone*'s position as a 'magnifico' chimes with the doubts contemporaries harboured about the authenticity" of Cecil's status as an aristocrat (113). Likewise, Dutton reports that contemporary "gossip credited" Cecil, like *Volpone* "with a voracious sexual appetite" (117). Dutton finds evidence for linking the religious elements of the play with Cecil's own religious positions (127), and he also finds evidence to suggest that Cecil's status as Jonson's patron may have affected the drama, as "Mosca's presence alongside *Volpone* for so much of the play serves to heap humiliation upon humiliation upon the grand and usually complacent patron" (132).

In a typically measured conclusion, Dutton concedes that he has "no smoking gun which convicts Jonson of writing an anti-Cecil play in *Volpone*, and specifically of doing so in response to what he judged to be Cecil's role in the Gunpowder Plot.... There is no narrative parallel to be deciphered, and where characters seem to cry out to be identified—as Sir Pol does, or even *Volpone* himself—the issue

turns out to be more complex and multifaceted than we might have wished” (133). Nevertheless, Dutton brings as much of the available evidence for his case together as is presently possible to assemble, and he makes as much of that evidence as the data will allow. Other scholars have already begun to weigh in with arguments and counter-arguments of their own, and so Dutton’s book has already begun to serve its primary and most important purpose: directing us back to the play, back to the archives, back to the available data so that we can consider and test the plausible—if unproven and perhaps unprovable—claims made in a volume that is the characteristic product of a very fine scholar.

Michael J. Redmond. *Shakespeare, Politics, and Italy: Intertextuality on the Jacobean Stage*. Farnham, Surrey, UK and Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2009. x + 242pp. \$99.95. Review by HUGH F. WILSON, GRAMBLING STATE UNIVERSITY.

In “Of Studies,” Lord Bacon remarks that some books are to be tasted, some books devoured whole, and some books need to be digested more slowly; this one takes time for digestion. *Shakespeare, Politics, and Italy: Intertextuality on the Jacobean Stage* does not so much “conclude,” as end—abruptly—on an apparent sarcasm. Having re-read his study, I have come to understand Professor Redmond’s ideas much better now. The five chapters offer thoughtful discussions of three of Shakespeare’s plays—*Measure for Measure*, *The Tempest*, and *Cymbeline*—with a few incidental references to several others, but this is, from my perspective, a rather cynical book. At one level, the entire discussion takes place within the context of debates over Italy and proper English identity; at another level, this book seems to make very disturbing, very worldly claims about politics as such. I am not disturbed by the perennial cynical claims per se—I am surprised that they seemed to be given credence. Within the several competing discourses of national identity, Redmond argues that Italy (or sometimes ancient Rome) often serves as an equivocal touchstone for Jacobean drama.

Despite the first word of the title of this study, other Jacobean plays and playwrights, essayists and political writers often relegate

Shakespeare to the wings and take the spotlight. From the perspective of those interested in Shakespeare, the protracted postponement of the Bard can resemble a frustrating “bait and switch,” a portrayal of the age “without the Prince.” The index reveals that Shakespeare or his work are only mentioned in slightly over half the text, in roughly 108 pages of 204; Machiavelli appears on at least 70 pages, Ben Jonson (mostly on *Volpone*) on about 40 pages, and John Marston, 37. The submergence of Shakespeare, and scattered obiter dicta making controversial pronouncements, caused me palpable unease on my first reading, and the absence of discussion of the Italian “sources” of the plays was another disappointment, but that latter objection seems unfair in hindsight: Redmond is offering and illustrating another, arguably more promising, approach now that most sources appear to have been identified. Redmond acknowledges that his project really began as a study of “the representation of Italy in Jacobean drama,” not as a study of Shakespeare per se. The second major word in the title of his book, “politics” is limited to just a few of the many bitter conflicts that vexed Jacobean England. Dissensions among the aristocracy, the gentry and commoners; conflicts between King and Parliament, Anglicans and Puritans, court and the country, incumbent Grandees and potential Levellers, are largely ignored. In contrast, the concern with Elizabethan and Jacobean representations of Italy and the Italians is pervasive.

Chapter I doubles as an Introduction and a celebration of intertextual methodology as a liberating mode of research. In accord with the customary new historicist polemic, which Richard Strier has credibly challenged as overstated, “early modern intertextuality” is celebrated as a “dynamic process of allusion, quotation and revision.” Each generation tends to challenge its immediate elders; older scholarship is both silently assimilated and cursorily dismissed. Discourse and “intertextuality” are inherently open-ended, intentionally polymorphous, polysemous, plastic concepts. With a grand flourish, we are told that “Italy was synonymous with intertextuality in early modern English culture” (2). This is a sort of annoying topical chauvinism toward all things Italian, as if one were to claim that New Orleans jazz or cuisine were synonymous with music or food. While touching on Machiavelli, Guicciardini and Castiglione, Redmond offers what he

purports is the under-studied “place of Italy in the cultural politics of Shakespeare and his contemporaries” (3-4). Redmond’s own rich and intriguing footnotes, however, undermine the idea that Italy and the Italians, and their representations in England and English literature, have never been considered before; Redmond’s book adds to the discussion in a memorable way, but it is not *sui generis*. Although Redmond claims that there “may be no acknowledged textual references to the Florentine [Machiavelli] in any of his [Shakespeare’s] plays” (6), other scholars argue that there are clear references to Machiavellian ideas scattered in the plays, from *The Taming of the Shrew*, through the second tetralogy and beyond. For the literary or cultural historian, the labored argumentation for the influence of Machiavelli is true but seems rather obvious. The occasional use of jargon—“semantic currency” (meaning) and tendentious claims that mere spectators “become complicit in their intertextuality” (as if spectating or reading were necessarily inherently immoral, conspiratorial acts) or the metaphoric use of “negotiation”—is also sometimes annoying.

The initial chapter contains passing mentions of *Othello*, *Measure for Measure*, *Twelfth Night*, *Comedy of Errors*, *Midsummer Night’s Dream*, but there is little discussion of Shakespeare’s work until near chapter’s end when Marston’s *Antonio and Mellida*, *Antonio’s Revenge* and “The Murder of Gonzago” are considered in relation to *Hamlet*. Redmond’s main point appears to be the ubiquity of “the use of Italianate drama as a vehicle for political commentary on the English stage” (23). While Redmond warns us of the danger of neglecting “importance of chronology” (25), he discusses some of his chosen plays in an inverted chronological order: first, *The Tempest*, and then *Measure for Measure*. Still, the first chapter concludes with a useful overview of each following chapter.

Chapter II discusses Jonson’s *Volpone* and includes a discussion of the stereotypes in (and the reactions to) Coryat’s *Crudities*, with a few passing references to episodes in *The Merchant of Venice*. There were also references to Ascham’s *Scholemaster*, Nashe’s *Unfortunate Traveler*, and Marlowe’s *The Jew of Malta*. This chapter’s discussion of Coryat was tough sledding, but the response to Coryat’s work illustrates the pervasive English preoccupation with the character of Italian political writers, monitory nature of Italian politics, the stereotypes



of Cinquecento Italy and the bugaboo of the Italianate Englishmen that runs like a red thread through Jacobean plays. Still, in Chapter II, Coryat's annotated, heavily burlesqued travelogue and the plays by Barnes, Marston, and Webster, successively occupy center stage far more than anything by Shakespeare.

Chapter III contrasts two iconic Italian authors: it discusses the rising reputation of Machiavelli, who was sometimes defended as a covert critic of the abuse of power, and the Jacobean era decline in Castiglione's reputation as *The Courtier* came to be regarded as mere propaganda for courtly self-promotion. Redmond instances the deceptive title of an anti-Elizabethan (which may be a pro-Catholic) tract, *A Treatise of Treasons Against Queen Elizabeth* to illuminate the prologues of Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta* and Barnes' *The Devil's Charter*. Redmond argues the introduction of Machiavelli and Guicciardini on stage by Marlowe and Barnabe Barnes is meant to "anticipate, encourage and frustrate" the play-goers. (Why these playwrights would want to ultimately "frustrate" rather than enlighten their audiences is not explained.) Despite the belatedness of English translations, Redmond notes the surreptitious circulation of Machiavelli's works and implies that Barnes' work shows that he admired Machiavelli far more than the Guicciardini he pretends to espouse in his ethical treatise or in the prologue of *The Devil's Charter*. The practice of Barnes seems to confirm the imaginary Machiavelli's remarks in Marlowe's prologue about his covert followers denying him. Redmond argues that both prologues, like the misleading opening of the *Treatise on Treasons*, are ironic, even deceptive. Of course, given his still-controversial reputation, trusting the utter veracity of a prologue by "Machiavelli," would require a colossal leap of faith. Where others might find irony, Redmond finds "confusion" and "ideological instability" (92). Redmond notes that in Barnes' play, *The Devil's Charter*, the Pope, in alliance with the devil, echoes the words of King James I in *Basilicon Doron* (92). Redmond attacks the idea that Barnes, either in his play or in the dedication of his ethical treatise, was sincerely praising King James by citing him as a positive exemplum, but he provides no compelling evidence for the ironic reading. In the end, he writes of the "uncertain place of Machiavelli within early modern English culture" (96). The next section discusses Marston's satire on Castiglione's *The Courtier* in

the Antonio plays while the penultimate section discusses Webster's adoption of George Pettie's translation of Guazzo as a source for *The White Devil*. This chapter concludes the discussion of "Italianate political drama" with a stereotypical new historicist attack on a caricatured version of old "historicism." The latter is unfairly implied to be stupidly static, while the former approach supposedly wisely recognizes Jacobean drama's "contribution to an on-going debate" (120).

Chapter IV finally begins to offer more reflections on Shakespeare. There is interesting discussion of the transformations of the disguised ruler theme in *Measure for Measure* and *The Tempest*. For me, Redmond placed *Measure for Measure* in an interesting and unfamiliar context; he offers a novel or neglected perspective on *The Tempest*. Sometimes his individual judgments seem debatable, but the issues he raises are genuine. Redmond's footnotes show that connections between *The Tempest* and Machiavelli have been made before (134), but Redmond notes, as no one seems to have done before, that the Italian states mentioned in *The Tempest* are exactly the same as those mentioned as having negligent hereditary rulers in the surreptitious Wolfe 1564 Italian edition of Machiavelli's *The Prince* with the false imprint from Palermo (121). In the same passage of *The Prince*, Machiavelli compares the coming of a time of troubles as the termination of "fair weather" before the coming of a "tempest." This discovery of a possible source of (or allusion in) the play is illuminating, but Redmond's corollary argument that Prospero needed to attain what Redmond calls "the *cynical vision* of statecraft" (125) or the "skills and *cynicism* necessary to recoup his title" seems out of keeping with the most common readings of Shakespeare's work (my italics in both cases). (One of Redmond's articles is entitled, "Low Comedy and Political Cynicism: Parodies of the Jacobean Disguised-Duke Play," *Renaissance Forum: An Electronic Journal of Early Modern Literary Studies* 7:1-2 (Winter 2004): Online. 13 paragraphs.)

Redmond shrewdly relates the initial scenes of *The Tempest* to the popular metaphor of the "ship of state" that derives from Plato's *Republic*, but he points out that Plato's Socratic parable, unlike Machiavelli's, was not concerned with the weather (123). Still, in Redmond's peculiar view, people seem to be Hobbesian wind-up toys, forever seeking personal power, and, in the vein of elite theorists like Pareto,

Michels and Mosca, “domestic dissent” is apparently “always already” all about the acquisition of power on the mere pretext of moral reform. Sometimes he seems to imply that the disguised ruler plays—regardless whether their author is William Shakespeare or Edward Sharpham—have virtually nothing to do with morality or any genuine moral reform (126). Redmond observes that the disguised ruler genre emerged about the time James I assumed the throne; he argues that at first, these plays might have expressed a hope for possible moral reform, but by the probable date of *The Tempest*, any expectations of serious moral reform from King James had already dissipated, and the genre became a parodic expression of cynical perspectives (126-127). Of course, Redmond’s own allusion to Prince Hal undercuts the simple idea that the disguised ruler motif evolved from unalloyed naïveté to unalloyed cynicism: Prince Hal is no angel; Henry V is no saint (129). He persuasively shows how the “failed” Italian states were used as monitory examples for the English: political writers used “the Italian precedents as negative examples” (136).

Redmond seems to make a “cynical” attack on both the “sentimentalist” and post-colonial readings of *The Tempest*; in his view, Prospero is a “ruthless” ruler (132), a virtual sadist (142), responsible for “enslaving” Caliban who has learned how to manipulate people for the sake of his own power. Sometimes Redmond praises the power of surveillance and even celebrates the necessity of spying in a broad-minded, “full spectrum” way that would gladden the heart of any devious administrator, temporarily exiled neo-conservative, would be fascist or incipient Stalinist. “Information” allows the ruler to dominate, to maneuver and to “extort” benefits “without getting his own hands dirty” (141). At other times, Redmond seems to argue that Machiavelli and Shakespeare are both writing to demystify power for the benefit of “a mass readership, denying ruthless princes the secrecy to practise their tyranny” (144).

In the latter part of this chapter, Redmond offers an authoritarian, very “this-worldly” interpretation of *Measure for Measure* that, in accord with contemporary European secularism, seems anachronistically to evacuate the plot of all meaningful religious allusions. Sometimes Redmond seems to read the portrayal of Duke Vincentio in *Measure for Measure*, like the portrayal of the Duke of Gonzago in Sharpham’s

*Fleire*, as mockery of the fatuous complacency and self-satisfaction of King James (157).

The last chapter challenges the simplistic patriotic interpretation of *Cymbeline* and discusses the play's alleged "ideological incoherence" (171). Redmond attacks what he calls "the Shakespeare myth," the idea that Shakespeare always knew what he was doing and always did it well (173). Redmond places the play within the context of Jacobean debates over Anglo-Scottish unity (176 ff.). He implicitly argues that Shakespeare left "ideological loose ends," confusion and outright contradictions. He points out that *Cymbeline* and *Iachimo* can both be regarded as depictions of King James I. *Cymbeline* may be an honorific depiction of James: his irenic foreign policy orientation resembles that of James, and even his family structure—in defiance of history—resembles the king's, but on the other hand, the depiction of *Iachimo* (whose name is an Italian variant of James) may be read as a covert attack on King James (171). Redmond claims that anachronism and extreme "incongruity" militate against a coherent interpretation and "a univocal text" (174). Redmond further argues that bringing in the anachronism of Renaissance Italy into a play set in the Roman era undercuts or "problematizes" the Jacobean imperial propaganda that supposedly eulogizes the union of England and Scotland under the aegis of James by means of the invocation of "pax Romana" and Augustan Rome. Redmond finds *Cymbeline's* "wager plot" and the introduction of contemporary Italy into the plot of an ancient chronicle play inherently disturbing. First, the play reminds the audience that ancient Rome "degenerated" into modern Italy; second, the plays show that ancient Britain had its own evil, "Italianate" or "Machiavellian" characters long before Machiavelli was ever born. Although Redmond rightly challenges the idea that Shakespeare's play was simple pro-Stuart propaganda, sometimes he seems to assume it was meant as such, and he alleges that Shakespeare must have been confused, xenophobic or even "paranoid" (191). In another place, Redmond echoes G. Wilson Knight's response to *Cymbeline*, "How are we to read all this?" (197).

In still other passages, Redmond seems to imply that Shakespeare was lucid enough, that he was simply or essentially "an astute businessman" (168) who was apparently trying to cash in on "the

booming patronage scene” or “patronage market” (195, 199). (Given the unpopularity and limited financial resources of King James circa 1610-11, it seems unlikely that the patronage scene was exactly “booming.”) The confusing metamorphoses of Posthumous and Imogen are invoked as implied proofs of Shakespeare’s supposed confusion (184). Of course, Redmond’s acute remarks about a xenophobia and the “paranoid construction of national identity” recall Richard Hofstadter’s well-known book on the paranoid style, and might well apply to countries other than sad, unhappy Italy or merry old England. By exposing the partisanship of historical narratives, Redmond argues that Shakespeare “exposes the contingency of all historical discourses” (190). Of course, the word “contingency” hides another controversy. One of Redmond’s sub-titles for this chapter implies that history is always written by the victors. In the same vein, Voltaire quipped that history was a pack of tricks that the living play on the dead. The word “contingent” can imply that historical accounts are dependent on the compositors and hence debatable (and who would argue) or it can be used to imply the ancient and ultra-“post modernist” claim that there is no “objective history,” no knowable objective reality to “history.” (Contrary to those who deny the Holocaust or the brutality of slavery, many could ably debate that latter claim.) Sometimes Redmond seems unsure whether Shakespeare was “a voice of English dissent or a shill for Jacobean Britain” (197), but in his concluding pages, he seems to opt for Shakespeare as an ambivalent “shill” who inadvertently allows for “dissident readings” (197-98). In the concluding paragraphs of his book, Redmond seems to make Iachimo stand for King James I (or for Shakespeare?) as the oxymoronic (and moronic) embodiment of incoherence (203-04).

The misleading reference to Shakespeare in the title of this book creates false expectations, but Redmond’s discussions of Jacobean drama are sometimes intriguing. His footnotes are rich, and his erudition is real. After a second reading, his prose unfolds better. In the process of re-reading, I became a partial convert, less hostile, and more receptive to some of his ideas—far from wishing “it were done,” I actually wished the book had a less curt, less abrupt, more summary conclusion; I still wish it had a more thorough and more tempered discussion of Shakespeare. One of the piquant dimensions of the

book is the possibility that there might be a vein of plausibly deniable autobiography in the chapter titles. One wonders if Redmond, the Professor at the University of Palermo, is himself an “Italianate Englishman,” re-reading literature as an erudite scholarly Machiavel who has won his Mediterranean “dukedom,” a tenured professorship, with his runic book, and who now, as a comfortably situated expatriate, is “no more a Britain” or a Briton.

Jeff Persels, ed. *Spectacle*. Studies in Early Modern France. 13. Charlottesville: Rookwood Press, 2010. xiv + 236 pp. \$49.95. Review by ANNE E. DUGGAN, WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY.

Under the general editorship of Anne Birberick and Russell Ganim, the series *Studies in Early Modern France* has provided a venue for interdisciplinary research since its foundation in 1994 by David Lee Rubin. Published annually, each issue revolves around a specific theme, from *Rethinking Cultural Studies* (2000-2001), and *Modern Perspectives on the Early Modern* (2005) to *Early Modern Convent Voices* (2007). For *Spectacle*, Jeff Persels brings together essays that focus on theater and performance from different disciplinary approaches and in a variety of contexts spanning the fifteenth to the eighteenth century. Interestingly, the focus of the collection is on the earlier part of the early modern period. Five essays deal with spectacle in the late fifteenth century, moving into the early sixteenth century; three essays focus on sixteenth-century theater; three essays consider spectacle in the seventeenth century; and one essay moves into the eighteenth century. While the seventeenth century is often thought of as “the” century of spectacle, this collection makes a unique contribution to theater studies and ways of thinking about spectacle precisely by focusing on the earlier periods of early modern France.

The first five essays present a complex picture of spectacle in the decades preceding and following 1500. Theater and public performances are treated from the perspective of their political and religious function, philosophical import, financing and production, and gender. Fabien Salesse examines the role played by the *Passion d’Auvergne*, first performed in Montferrand in 1477, in the unifica-

tion of the city's inhabitants. After the pillage of Montferrand in 1388, which broke its commercial strength, the performance of the passion play symbolically allowed the inhabitants to reclaim urban space, at the same time that it reiterated the principal sacraments of the Catholic faith. In her study of medieval laughter, Andreea Marculescu situates both farces and *sotties* in relation to philosophical discourses about laughter. Since the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, laughter was viewed as a quality that distinguishes man from animal, in the tradition of Aristotle. However, laughter must be controlled as well, in line with concern over mastery over the body and according to norms of decorum. Marculescu argues that farces and *sotties* from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century often use "immoderate" laughter to attack rivals, but they also incorporate more "civilized" forms of laughter, particularly in conjunction with the representation of female characters. Moving away from laughter, Matthieu Bonicel looks at the role of city finances and city planning in the production of municipal performances in Avignon from 1450 to 1550. His contribution provides us with a very concrete description of the material conditions—from the hiring of performers to the organization of security—involved in putting together grand entries, as well as occasional public entertainment sponsored by the city.

Essays by Kathleen Llewellyn and Laura Weigert have a narrower focus. Llewellyn provides an intriguing reading of Jean Molinet's *Le Mystère de Judith et Holofernès*. She argues that the apparent contradictions between Judith's transgression of feminine ideals of modesty, humility, and silence, on the one hand, and her exemplary value, on the other, can be resolved by reading the character's actions in terms of metadrama. Judith *performs* the role of seductress and executioner, only to return to her status as virtuous widow at the end of the play, when she insists that she was merely the instrument of God. While Llewellyn's piece deals with a positive Jewish figure, Weigert looks at how the mystery play *The Vengeance of Our Lord* translated into a series of painted cloth in Reims that in effect allegorically validated the Very Christian King's expulsion of the Jews from Provence.

The next series of essays deal with the influence of humanism and the preoccupation with the Wars of Religion in sixteenth-century theater. John Nassichuk's piece teases out the contemporary influ-

ences in Etienne Jodelle's *Cléopâtre captive*. He argues that Cesare De Cesari's *Cleopatra, tragedia*, Giambattista Giraldo Cinthio's *Orbecche*, and the aesthetics of the Pléiade were essential in Jodelle's reshaping of Plutarch's *Life of Antony*. Pascale Barthe examines the first French Orientalist play, *La Soltane* (1561) by Gabriel Bounin. At the same time that *La Soltane* plays on sensationalist accounts of Soliman the Magnificent, Barthe argues that it also stages the tensions surrounding Catherine de Medici's regency. In her study of Jean de la Taille's Christian tragedies, Corinne Noirot-Maguire situates La Taille's work within the context of the Religious Wars and the author's own personal losses. She contends that La Taille's tragedies are meant to arouse pity, reason, and charity in his spectators in the hopes of ending sectarian violence. As I read Barthe and Noirot-Maguire, Timothy Reiss's book, *Tragedy and Truth* (1980) came to mind, particularly his notion of tragedy as a means of working through political as well as epistemological shifts and their consequent disorders, which both essays treat in different ways.

Among the essays dealing with the seventeenth century, two focus on tragedy. Ellen McClure examines Pierre Corneille's *Horace* as a veiled critique of George de Scudéry's conception of theater. McClure approaches the character of Horace as a figure for the disembodied, stoic response to theater prescribed by Scudéry, whereas Sabine serves as an interpolated and emotionally engaged spectator, whose embodied response to theater (that is, the actions unfolding before her) exemplifies Corneille's conception of spectatorship. In *Pierre Corneille: Poetics and Political Drama under Louis XIII* (1992), David Clarke provides a sociohistorical reading of *Horace* in which he maintains that Corneille's Horace represents a critique of absolutist policy; McClure similarly reads the character of Horace in negative terms, but provides a theoretical analysis based on contemporary conceptions of and positions on theatricality and spectatorship. Bérénice Le Marchand's piece moves away from theater as such to examine the various forms of spectacle inscribed in the fairy tales of authors such as Madame d'Aulnoy, Charles Perrault, Mademoiselle Lhéritier, and Madame de Murat. Le Marchand argues that fairy-tale writers integrated elements of court culture as well as popular culture into their stories. While theater, opera, balls, and dances punctuate many



tales, so do marionettes and monkeys that could have been seen at the fair of Saint Germain. Works by fairy-tale writers, then, can be situated at the intersection of elite and popular culture.

The last two pieces return to the question of religion. Enrica Zanin's contribution looks at the problematics of representing *Oedipus Rex* for early modern playwrights. At the same time that the play is essential to one's understanding of Aristotle's *Poetics*, the very foundation of modern theater, *Oedipus Rex* proves problematic within a modern Christian culture: how can one represent the condemnation of a hero who innocently violated the law? Zanin goes on to examine how Italian and French playwrights, from Giraldi Cinzio to Pierre Corneille, worked through the moral dilemma presented by the play's subject. The final essay in the volume by Karen Taylor examines the use of theater in Saint-Cyr in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as a pedagogical tool for the education and socialization of noble girls. Taylor's study is especially interesting in its focus on the ways in which theater at Saint-Cyr evolved along with secular literature; eighteenth-century notions of *sensibilité* and experiential knowledge were important concepts treated in Saint-Cyr productions.

Together the essays in *Spectacle* form a complex tapestry of perspectives on spectacle in the early modern period. My only critique of the volume is the placement of the essay by Zanin on *Oedipus Rex*, which seemed to me to work better with the essays related to sixteenth-century humanist theater, and which could have made a nice transition from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century. Overall, the collection provides specialists as well as students with a history of theater and spectacle in their various forms through the volume's chronological organization (i.e., moving from mystery and humanist plays to tragedy). *Spectacle* also offers insights into the material, cultural, ideological, religious, and political contexts in which plays, public performances, painted cloths, and fairy tales were produced, as well as the ways in which authors integrated different conceptions and forms of spectacle in their works.

Jonathan Spangler. *The Society of Princes: The Lorraine-Guise and the Conservation of Power and Wealth in Seventeenth-Century France*. Farnham, UK-Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009. xi + 343 pp. + 5 illus. + 2 maps. \$124.95. Review by PAUL COHEN, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

One of the most exciting, recent areas of research on early modern France once seemed hopelessly old-fashioned: the aristocracy. Scholars such as Stuart Carroll, Jonathan Dewald, Sharon Kettering, Mark Motley, Kristen Neuschel, and Guy Rowlands—to name only a handful of historians writing in English—have breathed new life into the field by investigating questions as varied as marriage, clientage networks, the role of noblewomen, military service, violence, honor, and artistic patronage. Their work has transformed our understanding of France's traditional sword nobility between the Renaissance and the Revolution, demonstrating its dynamism as a social group and its crucial role in helping the Crown build the absolutist state.

Jonathan Spangler's new book represents a stimulating contribution to this scholarly conversation. A revised dissertation, his monograph offers a carefully researched study of the Lorraine-Guise family in the long seventeenth century, which sheds new light on the structure of early modern France's elite, French state-formation, and the social history of European nobilities. While the Guise are no strangers to historians, previous scholarship on the house has focused on the sixteenth century: on their power bases in Champagne and Normandy, Mary Queen of Scots (a Guise by her mother), and their involvement in Valois court politics and the Wars of Religion, most recently in the work of Stuart Carroll.

Spangler trains his sights on the Lorraine-Guise, the three cadet branches of the ducal House of Lorraine descended from Claude de Lorraine, a younger son of the duke of Lorraine who joined the French court, was married to a Bourbon, served François I with distinction during the Italian wars, and was rewarded with the duchy of Guise. He traces the family's fortunes between the dark 1630s—when Richelieu punished its support of the Queen Mother and Gaston d'Orléans' revolts by sending the house into exile in Brussels and Florence—and the happier 1720s, when it had become a prominent princely family at the French court and on the European stage. His

account is based on extensive research on marriage contracts, wills, inheritance inventories, and legal records of inheritance disputes housed in the French national archives and national library, and in provincial archives in the Lorraine power base, as well as triangulation between various court memoirists like Saint-Simon. By tracing the house's seventeenth-century social and political ascension (no small contribution, given that previous historians had believed the family to be in decline in this period), by documenting their important role in French political life, and by demonstrating that princely families like the Lorraine-Guise must be considered as transnational dynasties with interests across Europe, Spangler's work breaks new ground.

Spangler sets out to answer a simple question: how did a prominent French aristocratic family with substantial kinship connections and property interests outside the French kingdom augment and sustain its status, wealth, and power? He argues that the Lorraine-Guise successfully mobilized four strategies. The first is what Spangler calls "strength in numbers" (116): they multiplied lineages, rather than favoring one, and coordinated lineage strategies in order to strengthen the family as whole. One important consequence was that, at almost any given time, there were a dozen members of the family at court, all of them ready to cultivate royal favor. The second is the role of women as power brokers: dowagers in particular used their status and experience to help manage the house's resources, marriage strategies, and legal affairs. Third, the house made skillful use of the judiciary to advance its interests. Fourth, the Lorraine-Guise used their ties and interests abroad—as potential heirs to the duchy of Lorraine, and as property-owners in the Spanish Netherlands and Spanish Franche-Comté—to promote and maintain their status as a European princely house, rather than simply French *grands*. They engineered marriages with powerful Spanish, Italian and Portuguese families, sent sons into military service with France, Spain and the Empire, and maintained a veritable diplomatic network.

Spangler conjugates his argument in seven chapters. Chapter one traces the emergence of the *princes étrangers* as a distinct category at the French court, a group which derived their great prestige from their status as potential (and in certain cases, actual) heirs to sovereign states or principalities (like the duchy of Lorraine). With that status

came real power: the privilege enjoyed by *every* son and daughter of a *prince étranger* of free access to the monarch at court. Shared only with the princes of the blood, it provided the Lorraine-Guise a concrete instrument for exercising influence at court. Chapter two rehearses the origins of the Lorraine dynasty, the principle ducal branch's fortunes in Lorraine, the Guise's role during the French Wars of Religion, the establishment of the junior Lorraine-Guise lineages, and their extensive property holdings. Chapter three offers a case-study of how the house's leading mid-century figure, the comte d'Armagnac, used his position as Louis XIV's intimate, master of the horse at Versailles, and governor of Anjou to cultivate royal favor, dole out patronage, and promote his family. Armagnac fulfilled his familial duties with great success, sponsoring the next generation of Lorraine-Guise in France, as well as his Lorraine cousins. For instance, he convinced Louis XIV to restore Lorraine, occupied by the French since 1670, to duke Leopold in 1698.

Chapter four analyzes the family's marriage and inheritance strategies. They used their prestige to broker excellent marriages, which brought great wealth into the family and were often with members of the royal family or of foreign princely families in the Spanish Netherlands, Italy, and Portugal. Spangler also traces a shift in strategy, as the family increasingly used marriage to reinforce its integration into the French court elite. They structured marriage contracts to protect non-Lorraine brides' fortunes from Lorraine husband's debts. Women who married into the family and found themselves widowed did not remarry, instead transmitting their titles and property within the house and wielding their princely status on the family's behalf. Chapter five considers the family's staggering litigiousness, examining court cases surrounding family successions and suits brought by bilked creditors. Spangler shows how the Lorraine-Guise used their status, access at court, and privileges to manipulate the judicial system to their advantage: they had cases transferred to friendly jurisdictions; they prolonged litigation so that only adversaries with deep pockets and strong stomachs would persist in the fight; and they mounted breathtakingly complex legal structures to separate debts from inherited property, transmit patrimony free of liabilities, and rob creditors of repayment. Chapter six offers a case study of the family's management of its

lands in the Vivarais, in order to illustrate how the Lorraine-Guise used landholding in the provinces to extend and maintain influence. The Vivarais offered income, a testing-ground for junior princes to cut their teeth as leaders, an arena for placing clients, and a means to exercise influence over provincial estates. In chapter seven, Spangler situates the Lorraine-Guise within a broader European noble society. As landholders with properties on both sides of the French borders with the Spanish Netherlands and Franche-Comté, as a family with ties to sovereign dynasties across Germany, Austria, Italy and the Iberian peninsula, the Lorraine-Guise were members of a veritable “society of princes” whose interests and fortunes were not tied to national interests alone.

Perhaps most interesting are the book’s implications for understanding state and nation-formation in France. Spangler demonstrates not only how much the French crown relied on *princes étrangers* like the Lorraine-Guise—as military commanders, officers at court, governors in the provinces, channels for diplomacy, and prestigious social presences at Versailles—but the extent to which it sought to elevate them (through offices, pensions, and marriages). That the crown built the absolutist state in collaboration with the traditional aristocracy is no longer a novel claim, ever since William Beik’s pathbreaking work on Languedoc or Guy Rowland’s more recent research on the nobility in Louis XIV’s army, but it receives ample confirmation here. That the monarchy relied so heavily on transnational dynasties like the Lorraine-Guise, however, is a more original finding. Spangler shows how the crown made ample use of the family’s property interests and connections on both sides of the French border with the Spanish Netherlands and Franche-Comté to consolidate its authority in newly acquired territories in these regions. Whereas traditional narratives link the rise of state and nation in predictably teleological ways, his work illustrates just how transnational the absolutist state was. Though the author soft-pedals his analysis by characterizing these international princes as simply a “transitional component” (264), his transnational approach may be the most original feature of his work, and invites future research. Were not such families part and parcel of European states and social elites up until the Revolution?

The volume would have been well served by closer proofreading. “Henry of Navarre” coexists with “Henri de Navarre” in various combinations—sometimes in the very same sentence (26); quotes are inconsistently presented in the French original and in English translation in the body of the text. These are, however, minor criticisms. This monograph will take its place as an important contribution to our understanding of the French—and indeed European—nobility in the early modern period.

Francis J. Sypher, Jr., ed. and trans. *Liber A: 1628-1700 of the Collegiate Church of New York*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009. lxxvii + 374 + 11 illus. \$49.00. Review by ALLAN J. JANSSEN, NEW BRUNSWICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Students of American history, of the American church, and of the history of New Netherlands, as well as those interested in the history of Manhattan’s oldest church, owe Francis J. Sypher, Jr., a debt of gratitude. His transcription and translation of the folio-sized document entitled *Liber A* is not only a mine of vital information; it is a delight. This volume is a transcription of the original Dutch handwritten documents and a fine translation set out on facing pages. *Liber A* contains a variety of documents, including not incidentally the charter for that church, but also consisting of proclamations, negotiations concerning property, internal church matters, and so on. This volume does not include membership records, which have been available to the public in other venues. *Liber A* spans the period of time when Dominee Henricus Selijns was the pastor of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in New York (now known as the Collegiate Church), i.e., the years 1682-1702.

The Dutch church was the first church in Manhattan, established by the classis of Amsterdam and dates its beginnings to 1628 when the classis sent a “visitor of the sick,” Bastian Krol, to act in the stead of a minister. The church existed under the authority of the Dutch classis (a classis is a consortium of neighboring churches that functions under the Dutch church order much as a bishop does in a church governed by an episcopate). When Manhattan came under British rule

in 1664, the Dutch church was no longer established. However, since the populace remained largely Dutch, the Dutch church remained side by side with the now established Anglican church.

The documents presented in this volume offer several interesting glimpses into the life of the church within the colony. One such is of the relation between the church and the government. Since it was under the authority of Dutch church order, the church was perforce loyal to the Netherlands. However, it also had to pay proper homage to the English royals. This may have been made easier by the fact that a member of the house of Orange sat on the throne of England. A number of proclamations in this volume give reference to that fact.

Still other documents manifest the interaction between civil and ecclesiastical authorities. One such is an odd document that reads like a forensic coroner's report on the death of a sailor, questioning whether he had been properly treated. More importantly, perhaps, students of the era will compare the names of ecclesiastical office-bearers with civic leaders. Of signal importance are the initiatives for the construction of a new church building, this one on Garden Street. The original church in the fort had become unsuitable. However, part of the preparation for construction included the desire that the church become incorporated. Following several petitions, this led to the charter granted by William III. That charter is included in this volume along with Selijns' own English translation. Residents and historians of New York City will find documents around the legacy of the Fordham Manor in what is now the Bronx of interest. A governor of the colony left that large estate to the church for its use. The will was contested by local residents and a number of documents show the consistory considering how it will assure reception of the property. The property clearly was a burden and required the attention of the church masters. While living in an English colony, the consistory (its ruling body of elders and deacons) lived under the auspices of the classis. One can observe this relationship as the classis corresponds with the consistory. The church continued to have difficulty paying Selijns' salary and the classis strongly encouraged the consistory to remedy this matter.

*Liber A* allows a glimpse as well into more ecclesiastical matters. The afore-mentioned church masters played a significant role acting

as a sort of building committee. The church also employed *voorlezers*, those who read scripture (and in some instances could read sermons already printed and approved) and *voorzangers* who led the congregation in song. One set of documents outlines the hiring of a bell-ringer, who did more than ring the bell at appropriate times (and summon the minister when the service was about to begin) and so also dug graves, prepared the sanctuary for services, and acted as a sort of “head usher.” When the church needed a manse for Selijns, the deacons were engaged to pay for its building. The deacons held monies separate from the elders. So the new building was to be erected and the church would pay rent to the deacons. And they would have space in the parsonage for a deaconry as well. An odd set of documents note a theological matter. A certain Jacob Koelman is reported to have caused significant difficulty in the Netherlands. He was suspected of being Labidist, or of an experiential sect that among other things condemned church ceremonies. Apparently a couple recent immigrants were spreading Koelman’s ideas and so disturbing church folk.

Finally, I add a word of appreciation for Sypher’s attention to the Dutch text. His copious footnotes offer insight not only of translation, but of the various abbreviations used in the original. This work of scholarship is invaluable to those who work with texts, and adds to our fund of knowledge in the use of seventeenth-century Dutch. Sypher even had a special character designed for this volume to replicate one such abbreviation! His introduction gives the documents an appropriate historical context. *Liber A* is a noteworthy addition to the growing body of literature, original and otherwise, on the Dutch colony in New York, and so is central to our understanding of the history of the United States.

Rainer Decker. *Witchcraft & the Papacy: An Account Drawing on the Formerly Secret Records of the Roman Inquisition*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2008. xv + 262 pp. \$45.00. Review by BRETT F. PARKER, ISOTHERMAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

One of the great values of Rainer Decker’s sweeping treatment of the papacy’s role in European witchcraft trials from the late middle



ages to the modern era is to contextualize the Church's position on witchcraft against the backdrop of the constant struggle between secular and ecclesiastical authorities, as well as its attempt to limit potential heresy while not enflaming persecutions. In tracing the development of papal ideas on the nature and purpose of *maleficium*, Decker weaves a refreshing account of papal moderation and skepticism. Arguing that modern notions of witchcraft, both in the sense of evil deeds (*maleficia*) and pacts with the devil, were slow to develop, Decker emphasizes the Church's role in minimizing judicial abuses, restraining overzealous inquisitors, and preferring pastoral care in many cases over punishment. He also piggybacks on recent scholarship suggesting that not all witchcraft charges were aimed at women and that men constituted a "surprising high" proportion of accused especially in upper Italy (213). In all these ways, Decker provides a reasoned and balanced account of the Catholic Church's response to witchcraft, noting that there was "no dominant teaching" about the devil and magic but rather "a multitude of theories and ways of dealing practically" with the problem (215).

Much of the importance of Decker's work rests in the novelty of his sources. Having gained access to the Archive of the Holy Office in 1996, Decker unearthed a wealth of information from the protocols of the Roman Inquisition, sources that not only pointed to papal restraint in local persecutions of suspected witches but indicate a deep suspicion over the centuries of the validity of magic. Because of this incredulity, inquisitors "paid little attention to the magic that was widely used by ordinary people" in the late middle ages (14). What is important in this period, however, is the discernment of whether the devil was invoked or played any role in the art of magic. In most cases, the Church's view was that claims of magic were exaggerated or harmless and certainly not heretical. Moreover, adjuration and leniency were the preferred modes of resolving the matter. Thus, by the close of the fourteenth century, the church had no defined policy about what constituted witchcraft.

Things changed in the fifteenth century, however, as greater acceptance of witchcraft coincided with the growth of witch trials in the Alpine region. Papal documents show that in response to requests from local inquisitors, popes now accepted the concept of witchcraft

and linked it with apostasy, resulting in an increased number of death sentences. This new turn was most famously steered by Heinrich Kramer, whose book *Malleus Maleficarum* (1487) called for more aggressive witch-hunting. While Kramer was authorized to conduct trials by more than one pope, Decker rightfully notes that the Church had bigger fights with conciliarists and, in the following century, had little influence in German territories. This did not preclude the Church's involvement in the trials in Venice and Spain, which were often in response to criticism by secular authorities about ecclesiastical abuses. But Decker's conclusion is again that the church was not proactive or zealous but rather temperate in its encouragement of greater spirituality and its insistence on "high standards of proof" (84).

Moderation was more formerly institutionalized in the *Instruction Concerning Witchcraft Trials*, an early seventeenth-century document prescribing procedural matters in the cases of suspected witches. Not only did the *Instruction* cast doubt on the employment of the devil in magic but also afforded the accused greater rights. By imposing these measures on ecclesiastical judges, Decker insists that *Instruction* became a model for witchcraft trials over the next century and even helped prevent or limit witch crazes in Italy. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, caution continued to be the guiding principle of the Church. Death sentences continued to decline overall, although papal bulls calling for the death penalty in cases of desecration of the host were issued. It is worth noting that Decker sees the Church as still regarding *maleficia* as potentially a serious crime in the nineteenth century, but adds that it still overlooked a large number of minor infractions and, at least in Italy, worked diligently to limit the number of trials that scarred much of Europe.

On the whole, Decker has written a thoughtful, well-researched, and balanced account of the papacy's response to witchcraft. He adroitly blends the dynamics of local witchcraft cases over six centuries with the variety of ecclesiastical responses that shaped the Catholic Church's understanding of the nature of witchcraft, its distinction between the evil acts themselves and their intent, and ultimately the need for spiritual care and procedural caution.

Stephen Bull. *The Furie of the Ordnance' Artillery in the English Civil Wars*. Woodbridge, England: The Boydell Press, 2008. xxiii + 243 pp. + 27 illus. \$95.00. Review by EDWARD M. FURGOL, NAVAL HISTORICAL CENTER.

Bull has demonstrated that artillery, contrary to most recent historians of the English Civil Wars, played a significant role in their military operations. As important as this thesis is, the book should not be considered the definitive work on the subject. Either the author should delve further into the subject or other historians should follow in his wake.

The book breaks into non-combat and combat sections of three chapters each. The most detailed portion of the former deals with English (Weald) manufacture of cannon. Bull's analysis benefits from recent archaeological work at the Horsmonden site, which was owned by the Browne family, who built an industrial combine based on artillery production. The firm's prosperity in both the pre- and wartime periods depended not only on orders, but also securing their payment. As the author observes, obtaining the latter posed such a challenge to English arms manufacturers that they could not capitalize either mercantile enterprises or proto-industrial ones. It appears from the book's analysis that native manufacture provided sufficient artillery for the war. (Indeed, Peter Edwards' *Dealing in Death: The Arms Trade and the British Civil Wars, 1638-52*, 2000, states that imports were more essential for munitions and small arms for the cavalry and infantry than for artillery pieces.) The advantage of Parliament's possessing the chief production sites from the start of the First English Civil War posed a problem that Royalist activities failed to overcome. As a result the king's forces had fewer, older and less standardized artillery pieces, which exacerbated the underfunded regime's inherent supply problems.

In the second half of the book Bull's examination of fortifications, sieges and battles proves his contention about the value of artillery. (Perhaps he could have said more about naval warfare, which absorbed a substantial quantity of Parliament's cannon inventory, since command of the sea resulted in depriving supplies to the king and succoring besieged posts gave an advantage to the Parliamentarians.) The scramble, detailed in chapter four, for securing posts, whether

entire cities or single houses, consumed tremendous amounts of labor, money, artillery, and troops. Later in the war both sides considered reducing the number of fortified places to reduce costs and increase the number of mobile forces, but only the Parliamentarians (after the creation of the New Model Army) inaugurated that policy. (Indeed in Scotland, the marquis of Montrose's refusal until the winter of 1645-46 to fight a war of position accounts for a large degree of his success, because garrisons did not deplete his numbers nor did artillery degrade his mobility.) Generally, sieges occupied considerable activities of both parties, whether as defenders or attackers. Here Parliament's advantage in the quantity of artillery became apparent. And the king's disadvantages, exemplified by his failure before Gloucester in 1643, stand in sharp contrast. Bull's discussion of battles rests on discrete incidents in a number of battles, chiefly Edgehill and Marston Moor. Unlike sieges, where the absence or presence of large caliber guns, mortars or munitions often determined the result, battlefield use of artillery cannot be so objectively examined. For example, no one tallied the causes of death or wounds, and the expenditure of shot gives no idea of its effectiveness, since large amounts could be mitigated by muddy ground or poor gun crews. Nevertheless, Bull shows that artillery frequently played a role in battle. Or as he observes of Naseby, when the king advanced from an excellent position with his artillery well-sited to a poorer one that masked his guns, human decisions could overturn the "furie of the ordnance."

In the conclusion Bull argues that the failure of both parties to surreptitiously amass an inventory of artillery before August 1642 indicates that neither had a covert plan for war. Since both thought a single cataclysmic battle (such as Newburn in 1640) would decide the war, one could argue that prodigious efforts and expenditures required to provide armament for artillery fortifications (plus the works themselves) and to arm warships would impose unnecessary burdens. He is more correct to observe that the state of king's inventory of cannon (generally less than his opponents, and mismatched, which created logistic headaches), and munitions gave Parliament and their Scottish allies advantages in a war that lasted not just one, but five campaigning seasons. In 1648-51 Parliament's already substantial edge developed further, helping overwhelm its opponents.

The volume is based on meticulous research in the primary and secondary sources. Its ten appendices offer transcriptions of primary sources. Given the author's thirty years of research on the subject, he might have better sustained his hypothesis by providing analytical appendices. The reviewer realizes that the evidence prevents absolute comparisons, but relative ones would have done much in highlighting Bull's conclusions. He might have compared, for example, Royalist and Parliamentarian expenditure and acquisition of artillery. Or he could have examined total artillery held by the two sides in December 1642, July 1644 and June 1645 in fortifications, warships and armies. Turning to combat Bull could examine the fate of sieges (with tables on the numbers of those abandoned due to insufficient artillery or munitions, those decided by escalade, those terminated by breaching the wall, etc.). The lavish illustrations fail to support the appropriate text due to the publisher's decision to place them at the end of the book.

For anyone analyzing English state finances or studying local communities during the war, this book is essential, since it rightly places expensive artillery pieces and their associated fortifications at the forefront. It will also serve as required reading for early modern industrial and military historians.

C. Scott Dixon, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass, eds. *Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe*. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2009. xiii + 295 pp. + 20 illus. \$114.95. Review by ADAM SWANN, UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

This volume challenges the tendency to view early modern religious practice in terms of a neat dichotomy between state-promulgated orthodoxy and small pockets of fervent, ideologically coherent resistance. The editors draw on a wide range of contributions from various fields, and the eclectic range of topics aptly reflects the diversity of faiths which underpin the book. By exploring the "ecumenicity of everyday life" (33), the contributors demonstrate how confessional boundaries in this period were more fluid than previously thought, and that even the most deeply held beliefs and prejudices could be unseated by daily exigencies.

In “Emblems of Coexistence in a Confessional World,” Wayne Te Brake discusses churches built by dissenters, the chapter enlivened by a generous selection of photographs of extant houses of worship. As dissenters were “required to construct their places of worship in ways that made them ‘invisible’ to the public, though hardly secret” (75), these churches provide a valuable concrete reminder of the nature of theological pluralism in this period. Te Brake convincingly demonstrates that early modern practice was conflicted rather than conformist, and that rulers and subjects were persistently, if tacitly, renegotiating the acceptability of religious beliefs.

Keith P. Luria’s “The Power of Conscience? Conversion and Confessional Boundary Building in Early-Modern France” expands on the connection between religious and political fidelity, and in particular the tension between Catholic and Protestant conceptions of conscience. Since conscience signified the relationship between man and God, it was a powerful and potentially subversive force. It was held that one must follow wherever conscience led, even into an unorthodox denomination. While Catholics emphasised the inherent potential for heresy and political contumacy, Protestants believed that not to follow conscience “would be a sin” (116). In light of this, Luria urges us to reassess ostensibly tolerationist legislation such as the Edict of Nantes; the Edict did not provide true freedom of conscience, but only a choice between the established Catholic and Protestant churches. Yet the dichotomy the Edict sought to impose was undermined by the very conditions of its practical implementation, for, as this volume persuasively demonstrates, bipartisan loyalties were destabilised by the demands of practicality.

The crisis of bipartisanism deepens in Alexandra Walsham’s chapter, “In Sickness and in Health: Medicine and Inter-Confessional Relations in Post-Reformation England.” Walsham takes the pragmatic aspects of religious practice to their most fundamental level, examining the extent to which denominational factors influenced decisions relating to medical conditions and their cures. This chapter shows how religious differences were commonly overcome in times of great urgency, and “how flexible consciences could be when physical and psychological affliction became unbearable” (174). Protestants and Catholics were willing to treat and be treated by one another,

and it was not uncommon for people to convert after being healed by a member of the opposite denomination. Nevertheless, Walsham is careful to remind us that both denominations remained aware of their differences; Catholics and Protestants visited the same salubrious springs, but believed that they worked either “through the intercession of their saintly patron or as a result of providence working in concert with natural causes” (176).

Three chapters are devoted to the topic of mixed denomination marriages, and this comprehensive triptych is the strongest section of the volume. Dagmar Friest begins by challenging the perception of mixed marriages as “perfect proof of people’s indifference towards their religious convictions” (203), and his contribution shows how mixed marriages tended to reinforce differences rather than elide them. In the next chapter, Benjamin J. Kaplan marshals a wealth of statistics to demonstrate that, although conversions did occasionally occur in mixed marriages, the majority of these marriages were founded on accommodating denominational coexistence. Bertrand Forclaz concludes this section by noting that even in the marriages in which conversion did occur, the apostate spouse often reverted to their original religion after the death of their partner. An interesting parallel is drawn between such marriages and the crypto-Catholicism common in public officials due to Catholic disqualification from office. Forclaz reveals that although mixed marriages were widely accepted in the early seventeenth century, they were treated with increasing hostility as the century progressed. This conclusion presents an intriguing challenge to the common perception of the early modern period as an inexorable march towards toleration.

However, the resounding success of the section on mixed marriages highlights the difficulties faced by contributors in the rest of the volume. As religious history is such a vast and complex discipline, it is difficult to do justice to a topic in a short chapter. While this volume offers a number of tantalising glimpses into fascinating subjects, its overall effectiveness could perhaps have been bolstered had the essayists addressed fewer topics in greater depth.

One subject which certainly deserved more attention is the interplay between religion and nationalism. C. Scott Dixon asserts that the creation of shared identity “is the question at the heart of

this book” (24), and that “one particularly powerful aspect of early modern identity was the nascent idea of nationalism” (12). It seems strange, then, that one of the editors would recognise the connection between religious and national identity, and then go on to neglect this topic in the volume itself. Dixon even suggests that “ideas of national identity worked to undermine tolerance and pluralism” (13), and this could have provided a valuable starting point from which to consider if the diminution of religious orthodoxy presented a challenge to the coherency of national identity.

These are relatively minor flaws, however, in an otherwise engaging collection. This volume provides a compelling overview of early modern religious pluralism, reminding us that “coexistence was the rule, rather than the exception, in the Reformation and post-Reformation eras” (76).

Christopher Dyer and Catherine Richardson, eds. *William Dugdale, Historian, 1605-1686: His Life, His Writings and His County*. Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2009. xvi + 248 pp. + 52 illus. \$95.00.  
Review by CHARLES W. A. PRIOR, UNIVERSITY OF HULL.

This volume of eleven essays stems from a conference held to mark the 350<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the publication of William Dugdale’s *Antiquities of Warwickshire*. A prolific historian and antiquary, Dugdale was a herald by profession, rising to the position of Garter King of Arms in 1677. When compared to his erudition, his formal education was comparably modest: he attended a grammar school in Coventry, but did not proceed to University. His genesis as an historian grew from an interest in his home county, and developed as the result of his making the acquaintance of an increasingly prominent group of antiquaries, lawyers, and national figures like Henry Spelman, under whose auspices Dugdale embarked on his heraldic career. Based in London, he made full use of the archives of the Tower of London, and libraries such as that of Sir Robert Cotton.

During the civil wars, Dugdale was firmly on the royalist side, and managed to pursue his interests. By the 1650s his first published works began to appear: a history of English monasteries; the *Antiqui-*



*ties*; a history of St Paul's Cathedral. After the Restoration, his works included histories of the law, the baronage, fen drainage, a posthumous edition of Spelman's important *Concilia*, and even an account of the "late troubles" that led to civil war in the 1640s.

The essays offered here approach this large and exacting corpus from a number of directions. Graham Parry's deeply informative discussion of Dugdale's major work, the *Antiquities*, places that work within the broader context of local histories, and pays careful attention to its author's use of sources, and the intellectual networks on which he travelled and which influenced the work. During the early 1640s, Dugdale rushed from church to church, making records on monuments and sacred architecture, and Parry demonstrates the extent to which a dislike of sacrilege constitutes a major theme in the *Antiquities*. The backlash against the Caroline church was deeply iconoclastic, and it emerges that Dugdale sought to defend sacred architecture as part of the texture of a national history.

Jan Broadway's chapter examines Dugdale as autobiographer. Encouraged by Anthony Wood, Dugdale produced a somewhat slanted account of his own life, seen from the vantage point of 1681; the text dwelled upon his achievements as an historian, yet omitted personal details, namely the long marriage which produced nineteen children. Instead, the author of the *Life* portrays himself as aloof both from patrons and a large family—what survives is an account of a workaholic, complete with a fabulous account of a swarm of bees (symbols of industry) portending the birth of the future historian (36).

Indeed, as Ann Hughes explains, it was work that saw Dugdale through the civil wars. When he was not sketching monuments and fretting about the destructive advent of William Dowsing, Dugdale was busy documenting what John Morrill has called the "ecology" of allegiance. As the King sought to consolidate his support, knights were created, and the loyalty of local garrisons demanded. Dugdale's meticulous records of these transactions shed vital light on how people chose sides. The historian himself moved across the tricky boundary of 1649 with little trouble: Cromwell allowed him freedom to travel and, as has been mentioned, it was during the 1650s when his major works began to appear.

The Restoration saw Dugdale consolidate both his methods and his entrepreneurial approach to the dissemination of his work, via publication by subscription. As Stephen Roberts suggests, the trajectory of his career in the 1660s and after resembles that of Samuel Pepys: riches were gained on modest origins; networks were built and exploited; and, most importantly, a disordered world was tamed by a desire for order, classification, and taxonomy. This is suggestive, with the striking difference that Pepys welcomed what was new, whereas Dugdale clung to what was old, solid, and traditional.

The bedrock of this tradition was the complex symbolic world of the gentry. As Richard Cust argues, the context which contains the *Antiquities* is that of “honour politics,” complicated by a tension between established families and those relative newcomers who were compelled to announce their arrival with grand houses and entertainments (107). Moreover, Dugdale exhorted his aristocratic readers to embrace the neo-classical ideal of emulating the virtues of their ancestors. And, as Vivienne Larminie maintains, the gentry themselves took an active role in fashioning a particular mental world and prove, on re-examination, to be much more cosmopolitan than previously assumed.

Although Dugdale himself had gentry connections (via his mother), he was still obliged to raise his own position, and did so through the purchase of a manor at Blythe in 1626; he promptly set about the improvement of his estate, and in the process—as one of his neighbours would complain—trespassed upon the traditional rights attached to common pastures. Two closely linked essays explore this issue: Nat Alcock offers a detailed social and statistical analysis that employs hearth tax records to illuminate the social strata of seventeenth-century Warwickshire, while Geoffrey Tyack demonstrates that, in terms of Dugdale’s antiquarian interests, the country house was a barometer for gauging the rise and fall of the gentry, especially in war-torn Warwickshire. Steve Hindle’s masterful essay follows, and is based on a fascinating micro-study of the village of Chilvers Coton. Its “great survey” (a census of the parish carried out in 1684) has been used by social historians from Peter Laslett onward; Hindle is at work on a major study and, if this essay is any indication, it will add considerable texture to our understanding of

the “social topography” of England in our period, and in particular the condition of the rural and village poor.

The collection concludes with two further essays on urban and cultural life. Peter Borsay’s account of the growth and life of Warwickshire towns exposes a rare gap in Dugdale’s scholarship. For while he mapped towns, he was not especially interested in their social and economic texture, or the life of the “middling sort”; in this sense, Borsay’s exploration complements Hindle’s chapter. Finally, Catherine Richardson’s treatment of material culture reveals—as does Tyack’s discussion of houses—the complex manner in which all ranks of society carried on a process of self-fashioning; here the approach is reminiscent of Daniel Woolf’s seminal work, *The Social Circulation of the Past* (2003).

It will be clear that this collection is distinguished by remarkable depth and cohesion. It has been meticulously edited, with attention to detail that surely would have thrilled its subject: the text is clean, the illustrations are large and properly reproduced and, most importantly, the collection reflects a commitment to interdisciplinary research that is vital in coming to grips with the complex social, cultural, and mental worlds in which Dugdale lived and which he so carefully documented in his own right.

Ariel Hessayon and Nicholas Keene, ed. *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. xi + 255 pp. + 1 illus. \$120.00. Review by STEPHEN TAYLOR, UNIVERSITY OF READING.

In the Arts supplement of the London edition of the *Financial Times*, there is a regular feature entitled “How to judge a book by its cover.” The dust-jacket of this volume repays attention. The title dominates the cover with bold white lettering on a dusty blue background. Closer study of the background reveals that it is an image, a little bolder than a watermark, of a page from Genesis 1 in the Polyglot Bible, produced under the supervision of Brian Walton between 1653 and 1657. The reader can be in no doubt that this collection of essays is about words and, of course, *the Word*—indeed, it is about difficult words, complex words, words that require translation and

interpretation, words which are themselves debated in pages and pages of dense and learned commentaries. Moreover, while Walton's Polyglot is little known today even within the world of seventeenth-century experts, eclipsed in status by works like Hobbes's *Leviathan*, at the time it was hailed as one of the triumphs of English scholarship. It would be difficult to make the same claim for any modern volume of academic essays, but there is no doubt that *Scripture and Scholarship* is an impressive, and impressively consistent, collection. All of the essays, without exception, are subtle and learned; they not only recreate long forgotten debates, explaining why disputes over texts and manuscripts were of such significance, but these disputes are also effectively contextualized, revealing clearly why biblical scholarship was at the forefront of scholarly life in the early modern period and, indeed, why many well beyond the boundaries of the scholarly community took such a keen interest in it.

The volume is not divided into sections, the essays being printed in loosely chronological order, but some common themes do emerge. One of the most prominent is the relationship between biblical scholarship and heterodoxy, which is explored by Nicholas Keene (in an article on the New Testament canon), Stephen Snobelen (on biblical criticism and antitrinitarianism), Rob Iliffe (on Simon, Locke, Newton and the *Johannine Comma*) and Nicholas McDowell (on Jeremy Taylor). While the link between biblical scholarship and heterodoxy is well known, all of these essays offer some striking new perspectives. It is certainly surprising to see the ways in which Jeremy Taylor, one of the key figures in the Anglican canon, was mined as a resource by radicals during the English revolution. Equally valuable is the point made by Snobelen, though it is implicit in other essays, that even in the late seventeenth-century religious heterodoxy, and certainly antitrinitarianism, was "subversive of the *magisterium* upheld by the dominant church rather than of the Bible or biblical faith" (136). A second group explores the links between biblical scholarship and other spheres of intellectual activity. William Poole exposes some of the complexities of the ways in which natural philosophers, notably Robert Hooke and Francis Lodwick, dealt with the creation narrative in Genesis. Nicholas Cranfield, in an essay that stands out because of its examination of a visual depiction of the story of Jephthah,

illuminates one of the ways in which the Bible was used to underpin political theory and specifically arguments about the subjection of women. Eighteenth-century notions of divine providence are explored by Alex Barber in a subtle exploration of the history of King David. The interaction between England and Europe provides a third theme for the volume, and anyone who reads it as a whole is left in no doubt that English scholars saw themselves as part of a European community. This is highlighted in particular by the first and last essays, in which Ariel Hessayon explores the transmission of, and commentary on, the books of Enoch, and Alex Barber reveals the importance of Pierre Bayle for English scholarship in the eighteenth century. But figures such as Richard Simon and Spinoza, to say nothing of Erasmus, recur repeatedly throughout the collection. All the essays convey a vivid sense of the community of scholars engaged in the study of the Bible and the importance attached to their activity, but nowhere is this better expressed than in Scott Mandelbrote's rich account of attitudes to the Greek text of the Old Testament. Elsewhere, Warren Johnstone will surprise many with his account of the continuing importance of apocalyptic thought right at the end of the seventeenth century, and all scholars of latitudinarianism will need to read Sarah Hutton's demolition of the case for seeing Henry More as a "conservative conformist" (206) through a study of his biblical exegesis. What is perhaps surprising in view of developments in the study of the history of the book in recent years is that there is almost nothing in this volume which adopts an approach more rooted in social history. The closest we are offered is Justin Champion's ground-breaking study of *how* people read the Bible, an essay which will surely be the starting point for much work as we attempt to explore further the culture of English Protestantism in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

In general, this volume is refreshingly honest about what it is—an academic book on an academic subject. Readers should be aware, however, that the title could be a little more accurate. The focus of this collection is very much on the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, with the bulk of the essays concentrating on the mid and later seventeenth century; there is almost nothing on the sixteenth century, and anyone hoping to gain some insight into the intellectual

context of the translation of the King James Bible, which, in the popular mind at least, is the triumph of English biblical scholarship in the early modern period, will be disappointed. But, for this reviewer, the biggest shortcoming of this volume is the absence of a substantial introduction, an omission for which John Morrill's characteristically incisive and provocative Afterword, is inadequate compensation. A number of the contributors talk about the changing nature and priorities of biblical scholarship during this period, none perhaps better than Mandelbrote in his account of the abandonment of the search for "a single, pure text of Scripture" (92), but the reader is left to piece together the various insights into this process. It is stated on the dust-jacket that "The Bible is the single most influential text in Western culture, yet the history of biblical scholarship in early modern England has yet to be written." There is no doubting either of these claims, yet most early modern historians and literary scholars would probably not regard the task as a priority. An opportunity has, perhaps, been missed to develop the argument, not only that biblical scholarship was a highly important activity for early modern Englishmen, but also that its history is key to our understanding of the period. That omission, however, should not detract from the fact that *Scripture and Scholarship* is an impressive and rewarding volume of essays, which, individually and collectively, will be essential building blocks in the writing of the history of biblical scholarship in early modern England.

John F. McDiarmid, ed. *The Monarchical Republic of Early Modern England: Essays in Response to Patrick Collinson*. Aldershot, Hants.: Ashgate, 2007. xii + 301 pp. \$99.95. Review by JOSEPH P. WARD, UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI.

In a set of thoughtful and thought-provoking essays published nearly a generation ago, Patrick Collinson offered an interpretation of Elizabethan politics that embraced both its republican and monarchical elements. His argument took account of practices at the center of national politics, where some at court and in parliament viewed the monarchy as a public—rather than a private or personal—office and held that leading subjects had a responsibility to offer honest

counsel, even if it did not please the monarch at the time. Collinson also considered the activities of local office-holders throughout England, who, like many of their contemporaries at the top of the national political hierarchy, acted on the principle that they were citizens rather than merely subjects. Collinson's research set him in the midst of an unfolding discussion of Elizabethan—and by extension early modern—politics that has continued to be a model for fruitful, scholarly conversation. The volume under review here is a perfect example of this process. The editor brought together fourteen essays from several of the leading figures in the debate over the nature of English political culture, and Collinson, quite rightly, was allowed the last, though certainly not the final, word.

Most of the chapters address aspects of Tudor political thought and practice. Ethan Shagan's essay cautions that the republicanism of those active in national politics was quite different from, and perhaps antithetical to, the republicanism of those in local communities. Focusing his research on the Henrician period, he calls for a new look at several of the assumptions underlying Collinson's argument about Elizabethan government. Dale Hoak examines two of the central figures in the development of Elizabethan monarchical republicanism, Sir William Cecil and Sir Thomas Smith. Although their influence would reveal itself fully in the defense of godly reformation during critical moments in Elizabeth's reign, Hoak demonstrates that they had developed their ideology a generation earlier, in the context of Edward I's reign. John F. McDiarmid then continues Hoak's discussion of mid-Tudor humanism. His essay emphasizes the influence of Cicero among the Cambridge humanist circle that emerged in the 1530s, a group that included Cecil and Smith, and which won the admiration of John Milton a century later for its advancement of religious reformation. Stephen Alford then looks closely at the political philosophy of Cecil, who is in many ways the central figure of the volume. He argues that the hallmark of Cecil's approach was an emphasis on the royal counselor's responsibility to maintain a humble attitude but at the same time never to fail to offer honest, godly advice, even if it was not likely to prompt royal pleasure. Scott Lucas offers a compelling examination of the ways in which *A Mirror for Magistrates* exemplified, in its support for the principle of resistance,

the intellectual depth of Elizabethan monarchical republicanism. The discussion of the social depth of monarchical republicanism is advanced by Markku Peltonen in an essay that casts a bright light on the emphasis in the standard Elizabethan grammar school program on the classically-inspired rhetorical arts and the explosive potential that some contemporaries saw for the spread of eloquence too far down the social scale. After offering a sweeping historiographical survey, Peter Lake takes another look at the downfall of Archbishop Grindal to demonstrate the limitation of the monarchical republican ideology among Elizabeth's courtiers. He argues that her anti-Puritan circle of advisors held a distinctly different view of the nature of the English polity than did Cecil (subsequently Lord Burghley), Smith, and the others associated with the monarchical republican position. In an essay that has an indirect connection to Collinson's work, Andrew Hadfield discusses Shakespeare's *Richard III* and his three *Henry VI* plays as warnings to contemporaries about the dire consequences that follow from the combination of a weak monarchy and an irresponsible ruling class.

The discussion then moves beyond its Tudor origins. Anne McLaren's analysis of the published works of Scottish lawyer Sir Thomas Craig shows the contested nature of monarchical republicanism in the reign of James I although, and despite the best efforts of the first Stuart king of England to extinguish it, the idea would display its continued influence at political flashpoints throughout the seventeenth century. Richard Cust offers a case study of provincial magistracy that focuses on Sir John Newdigate, a late Elizabethan and early Jacobean figure on the Warwickshire county bench. Newdigate's reading habits allow Cust to explore the process through which the common humanist education of the time was absorbed and put into practice by active citizens. In an intensively historiographical essay, Johann P. Sommerville takes issue with scholars, including some of the contributors to this volume, who have emphasized the Roman roots of the monarchical republican ideology. In effect, Sommerville seeks to rescue Collinson's nuanced approach to the potential influence of classical humanist ideas on Elizabethan politics from those who would stress the significance of republican thinking in the decades preceding the English Civil War. Andrew Fitzmaurice's chapter dem-



onstrates the influence of humanist-inspired monarchical republican thought in critiques of factionalism in the early American colonies. Quentin Skinner's essay traces the course of monarchical republicanism through the seventeenth-century revolutions. Although Charles I vehemently rejected suggestions by contemporaries such as Henry Parker that England embrace a monarchy that could not be arbitrary, and although some radicals would subsequently insist that monarchy was inherently incompatible with a republic, by the 1690s monarchical republicanism had become fully realized in England.

In the volume's final essay, Collinson displays, once again, his absolute command of the field. He reviews the state of knowledge at the time that he developed his hypothesis and then traces several of the most important historiographical developments between the appearance of his articles and the completion of the volume under review here. He then graciously discusses each of the volume's chapters, engaging most fruitfully with the critiques of his approach offered by Shagan and Lake.

Collections of essays aspire to be multi-authored books, but this is the rare example that fulfills its promise. Imaginatively and successfully executed (complete with a full bibliography of sources and works!), *The Monarchical Republic of Early Modern England* can serve as a model for a genre of scholarly publication that, for good reason, is often maligned.

Jon Parkin. *Taming the Leviathan: The Reception of the Political and Religious Ideas of Thomas Hobbes in England 1640-1700*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007. \$125. xi + 449. Review by GEOFFREY M. VAUGHAN, ASSUMPTION COLLEGE.

Jon Parkin argues that Hobbes's method of reasoning—formulating a series of paradoxes that result in unconventional conclusions—was so powerful that his contemporaries (a) could not allow him to turn men's heads, and (b) could not refute him. Perhaps that last is stronger than what Parkin actually claims. Rather, he says that Hobbes's contemporary critics chose to adopt many of his ideas even while denouncing the author. The ideas were just too good to

pass up, even if the “Monster of Malmesbury” was too dangerous to range free. Something of a caricature of Hobbes was developed to disguise their borrowings and warn others from even reading him. One might describe this as the B.B. King method of refutation: “There ain’t nobody here but us chickens.”

Far more than a chronicle of Hobbes’s reception between 1640 and 1700, this remarkable book provides new insight into the structure of Hobbes’s arguments, focusing upon what Parkin describes as “Hobbes’s seductive ambiguity” (16). Yet one might characterize Parkin’s argument in similar terms. For instance, in the Introduction Parkin tells us that, had the Royalists won the Civil War, Hobbes might very well have been “the toast of English society rather than its philosophical bogeyman” (12). Yet the first chapter, which details the reception of his work before *Leviathan* and largely while the war was still being decided, records significant and persistent criticisms from figures who would later develop into Hobbes’s greatest opponents, such as Bramhall, and those who had no direct involvement in English politics, such as Grotius (34-35). Could Hobbes’s reputation really have avoided its fate? This is a seductive speculation, but I cannot tell if Parkin actually believes it.

Parkin does not set out to establish Hobbes as a conventional Anglican or a straightforward Royalist. There is no grand effort at revisionism here as he clearly states that Hobbes rewrote Christianity in *Leviathan* in a “radical, and occasionally downright bizarre fashion” (92). Nevertheless, Parkin does a very good job of explaining the ways in which Hobbes’s arguments caught his contemporaries off guard precisely by being so similar to them. In reference to Bramhall, but applicable to many others, he writes, “As would so often be the case, Hobbes’s theory, with its uncompromisingly paradoxical statements, came under fire from those in danger of being associated with its heterodoxy” (43-44). Hobbes’s conclusions were heterodox, his paradoxes were novel, but the trajectory of his arguments were unnervingly similar to those of many more mainstream authors. This, claims Parkin, explains the excessive reactions to what were, at first, some obscure little books. The second edition of *De Cive* and the subsequent publication of *Human Nature* and *De Corpore Politico* merely entrenched

the earlier responses. And once republicans started using his work to refute royalism, the stage was set for the main event, *Leviathan*.

Parkin gives *Leviathan* its own chapter, covering the years 1651-1654, but the next two, “The storm (1654-1658)” and “Restoration (1658-1666),” are also about his most famous work. Apart from select scholars and, perhaps, a Continental audience, *Leviathan* did and will always command attention. The chronological divisions of Parkin’s chapters, while not novel, are ingeniously developed and portray a cascade of political events that pick up Hobbes’s book and dash it against the dangerous rocks of the engagement controversy, the Protectorate, and the Restoration. That anything survived is testament to the greatness of Hobbes’s work. That Parkin has three more chapters to go lends credence to the suggestion that *Leviathan* is an immortal god.

In the *Leviathan* chapter Parkin presents a judicious account of the changes between Hobbes’s earlier attempts at explaining his political views and his masterwork. This section alone will become a touchstone for scholars and students alike. He covers the argumentative structure, novel content introduced in *Leviathan*, the remarkable rewriting of Christianity mentioned above, as well as the “more obviously ludic manner” (93) of the style. For many this last is the most arresting feature of the book, and Parkin makes the important point that even his political and philosophical opponents “could not resist reproducing his startling metaphors and formulae in their works” (94). The title alone caused, as it still does, occasion for puns and jibes, and Parkin’s near exhaustive recounting of the ways in which critics did so is a pleasure to read.

The remainder of the book takes us to the end of Hobbes’s life and the decade beyond. The constant in the story is that Hobbes’s ideas were roundly denounced and repeatedly adopted. Far from simply demonstrating similarities between Hobbes and contemporary and later authors, Parkin provides detailed accounts of significant borrowing without attribution. Doing so without attribution was the key, for Hobbes had been so clearly and successfully caricatured as a result of *Leviathan* that no one could risk revealing this source. The plot in the story that Parkin tells revolves around which part of Hobbes’s work was adopted. Some significant authors adopted his contractarianism, others his materialism. Still others took hold of his

minimalist doctrine of Christianity. All of these had to be denied, of course, for the charge of Hobbism was both easy to attract and difficult to deny, as the legacies of Scargill and Cardonnel attest.

Hobbes was not spared popular political attention, which only makes the story of his reception more difficult to follow and more interesting. Thus the charge of being a Hobbist was both an intellectual slight and a social curse. Parkin livens his history with remarkable quotations from sermons denouncing Hobbes. In this atmosphere Republicans and Royalists, Tories and Whigs, High Church Anglicans and Dissenters all hurled the term “Hobbist” at each other. As Parkin puts it, his “arguments could be publicly condemned by all parties, but at the same time used to further each of their agendas” (362). For instance, Hobbes’s *de facto* account of sovereignty was useful to almost every party at one time or another. Parkin comes closest to explaining how this could be when he writes, “however disreputable Hobbes might be, it is probably true to say that his was the most coherent and widely known theoretical story about the relationship between protection and obedience” (414). One might say that he ought to have attended more to the coherent theory of the original author.

Parkin concludes his chronicle of the attempts to tame Leviathan, the king over the children of pride, by explaining that these efforts uncover “the strategies and tactics of his critics, but also the true scale of Hobbes’s intellectual achievement” (416). This is certainly true, and neatly explains what this reader finds so valuable in his book. However, I am also left wondering if a similarly close study of the reception of Hobbes’s ideas to the present day might not reveal the same scale of achievement. What is the particular value of attending to his critics, especially those whose intellectual achievements never amounted to as much? Is not Hobbes himself the more interesting subject? He is, and what Jon Parkin has offered in *Taming the Leviathan* provides us with every reason for returning to his works and questioning our own strategies for challenging and adopting Hobbes’s ideas.

Randy Robertson. *Censorship and Conflict in Seventeenth-Century England: The Subtle Art of Division*. Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009. xv + 272 pp. \$75.00. Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN, HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE.

In the past thirty years, the study of censorship in seventeenth-century England has undergone dramatic changes. Previous visions of strict government control over the press have given way to models of consensus and conflict-avoidance, inefficiency, and laxity of enforcement. For Annabel Patterson, writers and state officials entered into a “cultural bargain” which encouraged self-censorship and civility, with prosecution reserved for violations of this social contract. According to Sheila Lambert, early Stuart licensing was driven not by the government but by the Stationers’ Company, which sought to protect its monopoly on print. More recently, scholars such as Cyndia Clegg, Anthony Milton, and Jason McElligott have argued that censorship was not the sole province of a monolithic state but was a collaborative process capable of manipulation by a variety of political, religious, ideological, personal, and financial interests. With *Censorship and Conflict*, Randy Robertson offers a stimulating and provocative addition to the ongoing study of seventeenth-century licensing laws and practices as well as post-publication censorship measures.

To gauge the effectiveness of press controls and to arrive at a greater understanding of contemporary print culture, Robertson employs a series of case studies. The first centers upon William Prynne’s 1633 *Histriomastix* and Prynne’s subsequent trial. The second focuses on Richard Lovelace’s 1649 poem *Lucasta*, and the third is an examination of John Milton’s 1644 *Areopagitica*. Robertson then moves on to the anonymous poems of Andrew Marvell and John Dryden, and ends with Jonathan Swift. Like many post-revisionist scholars during the last decade or so, Robertson finds that the language of consensus and harmony was used as an instrument of conflict and debate. Against the model of a social contract, Robertson posits a “discursive contest” (21) among writers, publishers, and licensing officials. Writers did not strive for consensus, he contends, but sought to win a war of words. Robertson also rejects the vision of a generally lax attitude towards censorship in the seventeenth century, adding his support for the view

that contemporary regimes had the will, if not always the practical ability, to control the press.

Robertson offers nuanced and layered analysis of textual production, publication, and reception. In chapter 2, for example, he examines the skill with which Lovelace crafted a royalist poem with enough ambiguity and artful moderation to secure publication under the republican regime. The inclusion of prefatory poems from Independents allowed, perhaps even encouraged, readers to read the poem in different ways. In chapter 3, Robertson explores the ways in which licensers entered public debates. Imprimaturs, he argues, could function as signatures of co-authorship. Throughout the monograph, Robertson reminds us that censorship was not only repressive but also generative. *Censorship and Conflict* thus provides a dynamic account of the multiple and sometimes competing elements converging to shape the experiences of writers, government officials, and readers.

Case studies afford an excellent opportunity for rich analysis. At the same time, it can prove tempting to generalize beyond evidentiary bounds. From a close reading of *Histriomastix*, for example, Robertson concludes that Prynne launched the first strike in a “continuous chain” (69) leading to the outbreak of civil war the following decade. In the absence of historical contextualization such a bold conclusion is both premature and puzzling. To take another instance, at the very end of a chapter devoted to Milton’s anti-censorship treatise *Areopagitica*, Robertson concludes that Milton’s acceptance of the position of press licenser in 1651 marks a continuity of principle. Without a more detailed examination of the press during Milton’s tenure, however, the argument rests on a shaky foundation.

Another difficulty is that Robertson often reflexively uses fear of censorship as an explanatory tool. For example, despite Milton’s regular denunciations of popery and royalism, and doubts that the ‘rabble’ could arrive at a proper understanding of religious and political matters, Robertson assumes that Milton’s refusal to extend greater press freedom to royalists and Catholics in *Areopagitica* reflects, in a simple, clear fashion, a fear of censorship. Robertson also assumes an unproblematic correlation between fear of censorship and anonymity. There were multiple reasons why texts might be published anonymously, however, and Robertson accepts that one quarter of

non-controversial (and hence less likely to be censored) texts were published without the authors' names or initials (24). Such assumptions flatten the analysis and reduce the complexity of contemporary print culture. The monograph also has a tendency to conflate the terms 'censor' and 'censure', which can be confusing and potentially misleading.

Though at times *Censorship and Conflict* raises more questions than answers, Robertson's provocative analyses and conclusions should generate conversation among historians and literary scholars alike. The decision to move beyond the customary chronological boundaries separating the early, middle, and later parts of the century is a welcome one, and Robertson's lively prose and crisp analysis expose intriguing lines of inquiry and add texture to the debates over the aims and achievements of seventeenth-century censorship.

Anthony Ashley Cooper, third earl of Shaftesbury. *Standard Edition. II. Moral and Political Philosophy. Volume 5. Chartae Socraticae. Design of a Socratic History*, W. Benda, C. Jackson-Holzberg, F. A. Uehlein, and E. Wolff, eds. Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt: frommann-holzboog Verlag, 2008. 241 pp. € 318. Review by LAWRENCE E. KLEIN, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

Anthony Ashley Cooper, the third earl of Shaftesbury, lived from 1671 to 1713. He was one of those later seventeenth-century figures, like John Locke, John Dryden and Joseph Addison, who were founders of eighteenth-century British thinking and culture. While his ideas about sociability and moral sensibility became themes of eighteenth-century philosophy, his desire to elevate the culture of ordinary gentlemen helped to establish a public culture organized around the idea of politeness. Addison's periodical, the *Spectator* (1711-1712) took such ideas further although these two writers were also quite different. Addison was a public figure, involved in politics and journalism, while Shaftesbury was at heart a virtuoso. Shaftesbury was committed to the development of public life, but he preferred withdrawal. While he strove to write polite essays for the educated gentleman, he was often scholarly and abstruse and sometimes radical.

From a certain angle, then, Shaftesbury was a patron of eighteenth-century polite culture with its aspirations for integration, cultivation and social peace. However, from another, he was a participant in the hectic late seventeenth-century ferment of “the European mind” (in Paul Hazard’s phrase) which was always dynamic and often radical and transgressive, as explored in recent years by Justin Champion, Jonathan Israel, John Marshall and others.

Shaftesbury loved study. John Locke having guided his early education, Shaftesbury developed scholarly *Sitzfleisch*, mastering Latin and Greek and devoting more effort to reading ancient works than modern ones. His polite essays had verbose footnotes to Isaac and Meric Casaubon, Claude Salmasius, Thomas Gataker and John Marsham, among others. Shaftesbury collected ancient texts in the key sixteenth- and seventeenth-century editions. (The volume under review contains, as an appendix, Shaftesbury’s impressive list of classical editions and scholarly works purchased in Holland in the years around 1700.)

Shaftesbury read and wrote much, but published less. His major work, *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (1711; significantly revised for the posthumously published second edition of 1714) was a miscellaneous work, compiled of several previously published pieces with added commentary. However, his published work was the tip of an iceberg of writing: aspects of *Characteristicks* are elusive in part because so much of his reflection was in manuscript.

Having appeared in numerous editions in the eighteenth century, *Characteristicks* was neglected in the nineteenth (though, as Isabel Rivers has shown, his ideas, mediated by others, continued to influence moral thinking). Interest in Shaftesbury has quickened in recent decades. The interest has been reflected in a spurt of editions of *Characteristicks*: from Oxford University Press (1999), Cambridge University Press (1999), and the Liberty Fund Press (2001). However, the most ambitious publishing project has emerged from Germany. This is the multi-volume so-called “standard edition” of both Shaftesbury’s published and manuscript writing, which includes the volume under review. The “standard edition” has been heavily criticized amongst scholarly reviewers, and, in response, aspects of the project have evolved.



Considered by itself, however, this edition of Shaftesbury's manuscript, "Design of a Socratick History" (and of several other related short manuscripts, appearing as appendices) is much to be valued. For one thing, the edition, by and large, rises to the challenge of rendering a messy manuscript readable. Shaftesbury's "Design" is far from a finished work. It is rather a complex set of notes and observations that Shaftesbury assembled over time with a view toward writing a major treatment of Socrates and his significance. Shaftesbury did have some ideas of how he would structure his treatment, but the manuscript is largely organized as notes and comments on the sources on Socrates (Xenophon, Plato, Aristophanes, Diogenes Laertius and a host of briefer ancient testimonies—all in a range of early modern editions from Ficino and Leunclavius on). Shaftesbury is well-known for having advanced the virtues of "soliloquy" as an intellectual and psychological method, and the manuscript is full of self-discourse too: "instructions" to himself, "second thoughts," "general cautions, queries, views, instructions" and so forth. The manuscript cites many ancient and modern works and is also heavily cross-referenced internally. This edition is not easy to use, but neither is the original. The physical aspects of the "standard edition" help a lot: high quality paper, a readable and large font, spacious margins. The editors have inserted a multitude of illuminating explanatory notes to clarify Shaftesbury's often opaque references and formulations. The introduction shows some excellent detective work about the timing of Shaftesbury's work on the manuscript and about the precise provenance of his sources. The editorial work is admirably meticulous.

For another thing, the edition makes accessible a valuable Shaftesburian text (previously available only to those willing to read it in the United Kingdom's National Archives). For those interested in Shaftesbury, this edition clarifies and elaborates many passages in *Characteristicks* that are brief and opaque. Socrates was an important figure to Shaftesbury. He made clear in the essay "Soliloquy," in *Characteristicks*, that Socrates was the founder or "patriarch" of Greek philosophy, which Shaftesbury sought to harness as a model for modern philosophy in his arguments against Hobbes, Descartes and Locke. Almost as important to Shaftesbury as Socrates was Xe-

nophon, whom Shaftesbury regarded as a philosopher. (Xenophon would be dropped from the genealogy of philosophy in the course of the eighteenth century.) This edition demonstrates Shaftesbury's detailed engagement with Xenophon's writings and allows us to see not only why Shaftesbury deemed Xenophon a better source about Socrates than Plato was but also why, for Shaftesbury, Xenophon was a better philosopher than Plato.

Finally, this edition enriches our view of how Socrates, in particular, and the history of ancient philosophy, more generally, mattered in early modern intellectual debate. Socrates was, of course, many different things to different thinkers. The edition's introduction contains a very intelligent discussion of the varieties of Socrates in seventeenth-century discussions of ancient philosophy. Socrates had long been identified as a founder of philosophy, but there was much to disagree about. Thomas Stanley, in his 1655 *History of Philosophy*, was not alone in regarding Socrates as a sage who found a way to Christian truths without the aid of revelation. But later seventeenth-century skepticism about Christianity, if not about religion *tout court*, took heart from a view of Socrates as a sage who illustrated the autonomy of rational inquiry and ethics. For John Toland, Shaftesbury's contemporary and sometime associate, Socrates was a freethinker. In this regard, as in others, Shaftesbury was more circumspect than Toland. At the same time, the intellectual and scholarly seriousness with which Shaftesbury addressed the quandary of Socrates and his significance has no equal in the period. For Shaftesbury as for others, coming to terms with Socrates and ancient philosophy was a way to define, negatively or positively, the task of modern philosophy at the moment of its birth. Thus, this edition makes much more widely available a highly interesting and significant barometer of the contemporary intellectual climate.

Dirk van Miert. *Humanism in an Age of Science: The Amsterdam Athenaeum in the Golden Age, 1632-1704*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009. xiv + 433 pp. + 11 illus. + 3 appendices. \$147.00. Review by JOSEPH M. MCCARTHY, SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY.

Although the University of Amsterdam achieved its present status in 1877, it originated in the Amsterdam Athenaeum Illustre, founded in 1632 as one of a number of attempts after 1675—some successful, some not—to establish distinctively Protestant institutions of higher learning in what became the Dutch Republic. Its first professor, Gerardus Vossius, an internationally renowned scholar and workaholic, gave the inaugural lecture 8 January 1632 on the usefulness of history. The following day his colleague, Caspar Barlaeus, a man of melancholic temperament, followed with an address entitled “the wise merchant,” providing the Athenaeum with a durable *leitmotif* that had endured to present times and shaped our understanding of the purposes, conditions and early history of the institution.

Because the Athenaeum had no archive of its own until 1730, the usual primary sources for a history of the first century of its existence, matriculation lists, records of faculty deliberations and curatorial decisions, data regarding academics, faculty and student life, do not exist. Municipal records providing details of faculty appointments, salaries and teaching duties have been the principal resource for historians. In the present work, Dirk van Miert has also exploited professional correspondence, student disputations, professors’ orations and the prefaces of their published works to elucidate the aims, curriculum and teaching practices of the Athenaeum. With these materials, van Miert embarks upon the project of discovering whether this institution, which differed from a university in that it was not required to maintain four faculties (though it was doing so as of 1686) and could not grant degrees, was operating merely at an elementary level to prepare students for universities, was offering courses at a standard of excellence comparable to universities, was addressing primarily knowledge of immediate civic and commercial practicality or was doing all of these. He is most concerned with the question of whether the Amsterdam Athenaeum dared to embrace the “new science” or hewed to the Aristotelian worldview of the Iberian scholastics spread

in the Low Countries during the period of Spanish domination. This translation from the Dutch of a shortened version of van Miert's 2004 doctoral dissertation at Amsterdam is valuable to scholars for many reasons. Not only does it fill in a lacuna in the institutional and intellectual history of the University of Amsterdam, it provides insight into the educational climate and practices in the early Dutch Republic and demonstrates impressively how an apparent dearth of primary sources can be overcome by imagination and hard work to retrieve a seemingly inaccessible past.

At the outset, van Miert recounts the history of the first century of the Athenaeum through the succession of professors and their contributions. The practicability of the curriculum for the wise merchant was considerably less important in hiring than the prestige of scholars and their place of origin. Because there was no long-term strategy for recruitment, an uneven distribution of staff shaped the curriculum and teaching practices willy-nilly and left the Athenaeum unable to cope adequately with the economic decline at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Thus by 1704 the "golden age" of the Athenaeum was over. From this overview, van Miert moves to a lengthy discussion of the Athenaeum's teaching practices, which embraced private teaching, public teaching, and semi-public teaching, ending this second section of his book with a brief consideration of academic holidays, timetables and absences. While adding a wealth of detail about the operation of the school, he concludes that in the general organization of its educational work the Athenaeum did not significantly differ from the practice of the universities. He is also able to conclude that the overall participation and interest of the "wise merchants" declined by the end of the seventeenth century. The largest section of the book, on the contents of teaching, is rich in detail provided largely by van Miert's thorough analysis of whatever information is available regarding student disputations. His treatments of the study of the rhetorical subjects of the arts, of law, of medicine and of theology comprise just less than half of this section, leaving the bulk of the treatment to the discussion of the philosophical subjects: logic, physics and mathematics, and moral philosophy. This is in line with the presence of these subjects in the life and work of the Athenaeum, as compared to the University of Groningen where half

of the student disputations were devoted to theology and only ten percent to the arts. At the Amsterdam Athenaeum eighty-one percent of the disputations were in philosophy and none in theology. Clearly, the Athenaeum retained throughout its first phase a propaedeutical character, fulfilling the felt need of its founders to perform a bridging function of transitioning students into university, even though it sometimes provided some competition for universities toward the end of the seventeenth century.

Overall, van Miert's investigation reveals an educational venture in which Aristotelian humanism remained deeply imbedded during an age of the emergence of the "new science." Physics forced itself on the attention of eclectic Aristotelians, but they dealt with new phenomena by incorporating them into the old Aristotelian framework with necessary modifications. Descartes made no inroads at Amsterdam until late in the century, Spinoza not at all. Illustrious schools like the Amsterdam Athenaeum survived by copying the universities and perished if they were too innovative.

By the end of the seventeenth century, the Aristotelian humanists had faded, but they were succeeded by empirical Cartesians because pure rationalist Cartesianism had come to a dead end. Van Miert thus concludes his study by agreeing with Anthony Grafton's observation that, "Humanism lived, deep into the age of science," an insight evidenced by the experience of the Amsterdam Athenaeum. Clear, graceful and thorough, this is a distinguished and rewarding contribution to the history of higher education.

Karen Bowen and Dirk Imhof. *Christopher Plantin and Engraved Book Illustrations in Sixteenth-Century Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. 458 pp. 101 ills. \$128. Review by LARRY SILVER, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

One of the continuing problems in the early history of prints remains the lack of attention to printed books, partly because they are located in their own special library collections instead of available in print rooms. Moreover, since so much of the history of prints is driven by the names of famous designers, frequently the anonymous

illustrators of books get neglected. Of course Dürer's long activity as an illustrator provides an exception to this tendency, while only reminding us how often the works of even famous printmakers gets lost when their works lie between the covers of a book.

Most early illustrations, especially in incunabula—books of the first half-century of printing—were woodcuts, because the same kind of press was used for the movable type as for the woodblocks of the images. Engraving required a roller press and also generated fewer impressions, although of greater refinement. In the second half of the sixteenth century, however, both in Rome and in Antwerp, the professionalization of engraving by specialists made the production of such prints much more efficient and cost-effective, even for publishers to illustrate books with them. The story for Rome has recently been published by Christopher Witcombe, *Print Publishing in Sixteenth-Century Rome* (Turnhout, 2008; published simultaneously with this book, so not referenced), but the main printer-publisher there, Antonio Lafreri, pales in comparison to Plantin (20 volumes versus some 115).

Now Bowen and Imhof richly complete this historical picture with the leading printer of the century: Christopher Plantin of Antwerp, active from 1555-1589. The story of professional print publishing in the city already has firm foundations in the study of Hieronymus Cock and the firm *Aux quatre vents* by Timothy Riggs (1977), his successor Philips Galle by Manfred Sellink (1997) and Jan van der Stock, *Printing Images in Antwerp* (Rotterdam, 1998). These authors are well suited for their task and have published numerous articles prior to their book. Imhof, Curator of Rare Books and Archives at the Plantin-Moretus Museum in Antwerp, has unparalleled access to the extensive records of the publishing firm, and Bowen is a trained print historian with a focus on Plantin; her earlier book considered his printed books of hours. Together, they were able to study both the books and plates themselves as well as the archives to produce this uniquely rich study. The firm foundations of their research are evident immediately from four appendixes: 1) Artists who worked on Plantin's intaglio illustrations; 2) Plantin's price calculations; 3) Plantin's sales of illustrated editions; 4) inventories of Plantin's stock of copper plates; 5) editions with intaglio illustrations made by Plantin

for others. Taken together, these data suggest not only the processes of production at the printing house but also the likely market and audience for such works with intaglio illustrations.

The first two chapters set the stage for the in-house analysis. First the authors trace an earlier history of intaglio illustrations for books, rare but not unprecedented (they omit the Lucas Cranach engraved frontispiece of *Frederick the Wise in prayer for that patron's relic collection book*, 1509). Then they introduce Plantin as well as his designers and engravers, part of the great expansion of quantity and consistent quality after mid-century in Antwerp. While these names might often be known to printroom curators, they still are largely unfamiliar to art historians more generally, but they were part of a business with printing presses like the book business of Plantin, the Golden Compass. Most of the engravers had personal ambitions for their own print houses and did not remain long with Plantin.

Because of the higher costs involved in producing and printing engravings, Plantin needed financial backing to begin such ambitious projects. His influential friend, Benito Arias Montano, sent from Spain to work on the renowned Polyglot Bible project (1568-73; which also had a score of engravings), also brought in a financial backer, Luis Perez, a wealthy Spanish merchant in Antwerp. The firm's archives reveal a later deal with Perez who received advance copies at wholesale. But the production itself required a new efficiency, which Plantin achieved with the help of the workshop of Mynken Lieftrinck, widow of Frans Huys, his first engraver (the authors note earlier her family connection to print publishers Willem and Hans Lieftrinck, father and brother on page 55). The first publications with engraved illustrations were: *Hours of the Virgin* (1570) and Montanus's own book, *Monuments of human health* (1571). Documents reveal that Paris, scattered dealers, and the court of Philip II of Spain provided the main purchasers of the former, while the latter had a local who's who list as well as sales in Frankfurt and Paris.

From these early projects Plantin began to work to satisfy the new demand for liturgical books—missals, breviaries, and books of hours—occasioned by the Catholic Reformation, as generated by the decrees of the Council of Trent (1563). Once more the impetus to a more luxurious edition with engravings stemmed from the orienta-

tion to the Spanish royal court. During this second phase, however, Plantin developed a new pricing scheme, graduated according to added features, such as engravings, especially with the complexities of registration of the image on the page.

During the 1580s, Plantin's last decade and a turbulent period in Antwerp history, he still produced a grand Bible with engravings (1583) plus other religious books, such as a religious tract by Petrus Canisius but also non-religious works, such as Lodovico Guicciardini's *Description of the Low Countries and the triumphal entry of the Duke of Anjou* (1582). Plantin still worried about securing the services of capable engravers and coping with rising costs. One cost-saving solution was to switch to the cheaper, more efficient medium of etching, also used for contemporary maps. But etched plates were not as durable as engraved plates, so Plantin's successor, Jan Moretus, reverted to the earlier model. Other cost-saving measures included reusing plates or producing separate sheets for the images, which also permitted selling some books more cheaply without added illustrations. Finance and practical considerations helped shape artistic production. Indeed, the final chapter discusses Plantin prints of texts for other illustrators' editions, especially print publisher Philips Galle or his friend, atlas-maker Abraham Ortelius; those associates remained the main producer of their projects and subcontracted Plantin. This kind of friendship-based business network resembles the way that Brussels tapestry firms cooperated with associates in the same industry in the next century, as revealed by Koen Brosens.

In both text and Appendix, Bowen and Imhof examine the book sales of the Golden Compass firm, a data analysis largely unprecedented in book history. They even count carefully the number of actual impressions obtained from one set of engraved plates, 4071, whereas etched plates, lasting only around 3000 pulls, had to be reworked or replaced. Such attention to detail enriches all discussion of the larger issues analyzed here about book and illustration production: publisher, artists, marketing, and audiences. Their book, both broad and deep, takes its rightful place alongside the two other great studies of its component parts, Leon Voet's study of the firm itself (1972) and Jan van der Stock's survey of all forms of printmaking in sixteenth-century Antwerp (1998).



## NEO-LATIN NEWS

**Vol. 58, 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.**

◆ *Odes*. By Francesco Filelfo. Ed. and trans. by Diana Robin. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 41. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2009. xxiv + 445 pp. \$29.95. Francesco Filelfo (1398-1481) is one of the best known, but not the best loved, of the early Italian humanists. He was respected especially for his command of Greek, obtained by studying with John Chrysoloras in Constantinople: when he was appointed to the Greek chair at the University of Florence, a position previously held by Guarino da Verona, hundreds of young Florentines packed the halls to hear his lectures. Nonetheless Eugenio Garin once described him as litigious, vain, and combative, while the author of an influential dissertation on Filelfo concludes that his subject had “developed an exaggerated sense of self-assurance which frequently bordered on narcissism and aggressive arrogance” (Rudolf Georg Adam, “Francesco Filelfo at the Court of Milan (1439-1481): A Contribution to the Study of Humanism in Northern Italy,” Ph.D. thesis, Oxford University, 1974, 13). It is always dangerous to try to psychoanalyze someone who has been dead for more than five hundred years, but surely personality issues like these stemmed in part from the fact that Filelfo was not born wealthy and spent his entire life scrambling from one post to another to try to feed his ever-growing family. Unfortunately the criticisms directed against the man have been transferred all too readily to his

work. It is true that the *Sphortias*, his epic poem on the exploits of Francesco Sforza, has not won much praise through the centuries. But the criticisms directed against it are noticeably harsh: one recalls the conclusion of John Addington Symonds, that “[o]f deep thought, true taste, penetrative criticism, or delicate fancy, he [Filelfo] knew nothing. The unimaginable bloom of style is nowhere to be found upon his work” (*The Renaissance in Italy*, vol. 2: *The Revival of Learning*, Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1967; rpt. of London, 1877 edn., 197). Indeed, given that this poem has never been published, one wonders how many of its critics have actually read it.

Be that as it may, Diana Robin’s edition of Filelfo’s *Odes* should go a long way toward providing at least some balance to assessments like this. Filelfo did not present himself primarily as a poet, but what he produced here is remarkable, five books “set in every possible meter” (xx). The Latin lyric poets were read through the Middle Ages, but their complex meters were not always understood and the most prominent fifteenth-century Latin poets up to Filelfo’s day—Enea Silvio Piccolomini, Giovanni Marrasio, Cristoforo Landino, Basinio Basini, Tito Vespasiano Strozzi, Giovannantonio Campano, Battista Spagnoli, and Antonio Beccadelli (known as ‘Panormita’)—wrote only in hexameters and elegiacs. It appears that Filelfo began to experiment in this area soon after he returned from a trip to Naples, where he was exposed to the work of Giovanni Pontano, who was composing in lyric meters at the time of his visit. Filelfo’s *Odes* are in fact the first Latin work in the Renaissance to use all the lyric meters from Horace’s *Carmina*, thus giving Filelfo a significant place in literary history as a poet.

A careful reading of the *Odes* suggests that the picture that has been painted of Filelfo’s personality and values may be too one-sided as well. Eugenio Garin, for example, wrote that “Filelfo always proposes to the powerful the same bargain: in exchange for writings in verse or prose, a certain number of zecchini, or florins, or ducats” (“L’opera di Francesco Filelfo,” in *Storia di Milano*, vol. 7: *L’età sforzesca dal 1450 al 1500*, Milan: Fondazione Treccani degli Alfieri, 1956, 545). Yet a

careful reading of Book 4 of the *Odes* reveals more than a simple hack for hire. The opening pair of poems, to be sure, presses for money to get Filelfo and his family out of Milan so they could escape the plague, and the last three poems reiterate the need to escape. But the five poems in between offer a nuanced critique of money and what it can buy. In *Odes* 4.3 Filelfo criticizes a character named Lydus for his all-consuming greed, and the next three poems demonstrate the futility of money and patronage, with 4.7 being a particularly arresting twenty-two line satire on what Filelfo sees as the modern obsession with easy money. Even when he needed it most, it appears that Filelfo recognized that money could not always buy happiness and that poetry could do more than serve as a job advertisement.

As one might expect from a scholar of Robin's standing, this edition is exemplary. The series guidelines accept a working text that has been previously prepared elsewhere, but Robin has looked at all eight surviving manuscripts and the *editio princeps* and prepared a critical edition using the best three of these witnesses. There is a valuable set of biographical sketches of the major characters mentioned in the collection along with an appendix identifying the meters of all the poems, plus an adequate set of content-based notes and an extensive index. The translation is very nice as well. It is always good when an important neo-Latin author finds a worthy editor, and that is exactly what has happened here. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *In Defense of Common Sense: Lorenzo Valla's Critique of Scholastic Philosophy*. By Lodi Nauta. I Tatti Studies in Italian Renaissance History. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2009. xiv + 401 pp. Lorenzo Valla (1407-1457) was the *enfant terrible* of Italian humanism: a committed iconoclast, he was accused of heresy by the Neapolitan Inquisition after trying to reconcile Christianity with Epicureanism, the ancient philosophical system with which it would seem least compatible; on the personal level he was just as irritating, engaging in celebrated polemics with other humanists like Antonio da Rho and Poggio Bracciolini. Yet he was not a simple rabble rouser: his attack on the authenticity of the 'Donation of Constantine' challenged the temporal authority of the church, but recent scholarship has increasingly stressed the Christian strain in his thinking, and his

work with the New Testament provides the foundation for modern Biblical criticism.

Valla's skill as a philologist has never been in question, but as a philosopher in particular he was long considered something of a lightweight. A hundred years ago Jakob Freudenthal recognized Valla's diligence in returning to the ancient sources but argued that he often misread the Greek and Roman philosophers and did not make any substantive contributions to the development of philosophy as a discipline. Seventy years later Cesare Vasoli produced a groundbreaking study ("Filologia, critica e logica in Lorenzo Valla," in Cesare Vasoli, *La dialettica e la retorica dell'Umanesimo. Invenzione e metodo nella cultura del XV e XVI secolo*, Milan: Feltrinelli, 1968, 28-77) that took Valla seriously as a thinker, thereby laying the foundation for a reevaluation. Over the next twenty-five years scholars like Lisa Jardine and Peter Mack returned to Valla's relationship to his ancient sources, arguing that he found there the basis for a simplified dialectic that could teach practical argumentation in neo-classical Latin. Nauta's book takes up these themes again, giving us the most important study of Valla as a thinker since Vasoli's.

Nauta's study focuses on Valla's major work on philosophy and dialectic, called both the *Disputationes dialecticae* and the *Repastinatio dialecticae et philosophiae*. The latter title suggests what he is up to, a 'replowing' or 'retilling' of what he presented as the barren, infertile soil of late medieval philosophy and theology, a 'repair' or 'rebuilding' of Aristotelian scholasticism. He does this not by engaging with the scholastics on their own terms, using their language, distinctions, and genres, but by going back to the *fundamenta* and starting with a rhetorical alternative based on Cicero and Quintilian with its grammatical roots in the tradition of Priscian. Language, he argued, can present a reliable picture of reality, the only language that can do this properly is classical Latin, and the only way to establish meaning is through ordinary linguistic practice. The Valla that emerges from this perspective is different from the one commonly found in today's scholarship: he is farther away from both Ockham's nominalism and Academic skepticism than previously thought, and while Nauta acknowledges some interesting affinities with ordinary language philosophy, he denies emphatically the claims of scholars like Richard

Waswo that Valla envisioned language as constituting reality. Nauta's Valla is both inconsistent and unfair to his scholastic opponents, but this is not surprising for someone who wanted to establish a new way of thinking rather than tinker with the old one. In other words, "[i]t is this antiphilosophical spirit that, paradoxically, renders his project philosophically interesting" (272).

*In Defense of Common Sense* tackles some knotty philosophical points along the way, but this should not scare off readers from other intellectual traditions: Nauta has a gift for clear explanation that is particularly impressive given that he is a native speaker of Dutch, not English. This is an excellent book, one that brings out the nuances and complexities of someone who turns out to be neither a deep nor a consistent thinker, but is nevertheless one of the most interesting and important philosophers of his age. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Pico della Mirandola: New Essays*. Ed. by M. V. Dougherty. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008. ix + 225 pp. □ 47.00. Pico della Mirandola (1463-1494) has been characterized as Renaissance humanism's representative philosopher and its flamboyant provocateur: the former due in large part to the *Oratio* (later referred to as "On the Dignity of Man") composed as the preface to his celebrated nine hundred theses and viewed as the quintessential humanist expression of human autonomy, the latter due to the drama surrounding his proposed public disputation of the theses. This collection, "a joint approach by scholars working in the fields of philosophy and intellectual history"(6) to evaluate the philosophical merit of Pico's oeuvre, admirably meets both its own goal and Farmer's 1998 judgment that "any comprehensive reading of Pico's thought ... must be a collective achievement."

M. V. Dougherty's Introduction summarizes, with thorough bibliography in footnotes, the controversies attendant on scholarly attempts to evaluate the merits of Pico's work. Dougherty describes Pico's influence and reputation among early modern thinkers as well as the growth of modern editions, translations, commentaries, and bibliographies. A description of Pico's major works is followed by a summary of the volume's contributions.

Jill Kraye considers Pico's celebrated letter to Ermolao Barbaro on the proper relationship of philosophy to rhetoric, which paradoxically employs a classicizing humanist rhetorical style to defend the inelegant expression but substantial thought of the scholastics. She suggests that the letter presaged the *Oratio's* praise of scholastic philosophy and theology through the resources of humanist style.

This letter's concern with language and thought and its appropriation of scholasticism also inform Paul Richard Blum's analysis of the thirteen theses declared heretical. Blum considers Pico's methods of disputation and exegesis as well as the papal commission's reactions, to conclude that Pico had offended in his deliberate transgression of the boundary the theologians wished to uphold between natural philosophy and theology.

Examining Pico's syncretism through the lens of the philosophy of religion (where examination of a thinker's pretheoretical commitments is crucial), Michael Sudduth finds that far from breaking with medieval tradition, Pico's work is infused with its elements. Pico's syncretism, compatible with the views of his fifteenth-century Roman Catholic contemporaries, is revealed as Christocentric, "lead(ing) back to theology and religious vision" (80).

Michael Allen undertakes an analysis of Pico's Neoplatonic interpretations in the early *Commento*, *Heptaplus*, and *Oratio*. Despite his Aristotelianism, Pico's Platonically inspired exegeses of Plato's *Symposium* and Genesis uncovered religious truths veiled in myth—in harmony with Ficino, a pervasive influence.

M. V. Dougherty deflates the reputation of novelty often attached to Pico's work, demonstrating its compatibility with the traditions of *quaestiones disputatae*, *florilegia*, and dialectic. Rather than intending a thorough survey of different religious traditions, Pico aimed to find corroboration and confirmation of his own views in a wide range of predecessors.

Sheila J. Rabin offers a lucid exposition of Pico's knowledge of magic and astrology. She asserts the "strong effect on Renaissance natural philosophy" (178) of Pico's positive and negative attitudes towards magic and astrology in the *Disputation against Divinatory Astrology*: his integration of Kabbalah into the study of nature and the influence of his criticism of astrology on the later study of astronomy.

Carl N. Still's essay on Pico's theory of mind concludes that although Pico's model of cognition fits generally with medieval scholasticism, it resists categorization under a single model or theory. Pico united medieval philosophy with ancient philosophy and wisdom traditions (e.g., Kabbalah) and advocated the fundamental ideal that the human being should transcend itself by attaining its highest capacities and taking advantage of every available source of wisdom.

Francesco Borghesi's essay (puzzlingly placed last) emphasizes the importance of the reception of Pico's thought and biography to views of his work and summarizes the major events and encounters of Pico's life and career.

The consistently high-quality, erudite, and thoroughly researched contributions examine significant questions in an expanding field: the continuity of Pico's work with medieval traditions, its relationship to Ficino's Neoplatonism, and the "syncretist" label. Scholars initiated into the mysteries of hypostases and combinatics, scholastic theology, and Neoplatonic metaphysics will find it essential. (Catherine J. Castner, University of South Carolina)

◆ *Iacopo Sannazaro: la cultura napoletana nell'Europa del Rinascimento.* Ed. by Pasquale Sabbatino. Biblioteca dell'«Archivum Romanicum», serie 1: Storia, Letteratura, Paleografia, 356. Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 2009. VIII + 428 pp. This book contains twenty essays originally presented at a conference sponsored by the Dipartimento di Filologia Moderna at the Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II in Naples on 27-28 March 2006: Pasquale Sabbatino, "Sannazaro e la cultura napoletana nell'Europa del Rinascimento. Tessere per la geografia e la storia della letteratura"; Nicola De Blasi, "A proposito degli gliommeri dialetti di Sannazaro: ipotesi di una nuova attribuzione"; Patricia Bianchi, "Le *Farse* di Iacopo Sannazaro: sondaggi linguistici e tracce intertestuali"; Enrico Fenzi, "L'impossibile *Arvadia* di Iacopo Sannazaro"; Francesco Montuori, "Note sulla compilazione della *Pastorale* di Pietro Jacopo De Jennaro"; Luigi Scorrano, "«Se quel soave stil . . .». Sannazaro in traccia di Dante"; Carlo Vecce, "Sannazaro in Francia: orizzonti europei di un 'poeta gentiluomo'"; Antonio V. Nazzaro, "Il *De partu Virginis* del Sannazaro come poema parafrasatico"; Franco A. Dal Pino, "Iacopo Sannazaro e l'Ordine dei Servi di

Maria”; Francesco Divenuto, “*Deos nemorum invocat in extruenda domo*. Iacopo Sannazaro e la sua casa a Mergillina”; Rosa Maria Giusto, “La città al tempo di Sannazaro”; Olga Zorzi Pugliese, “Il Bembo ‘minore,’ Sannazaro e altri personaggi napoletani nel *Libro del cortegiano*: dagli abbozzi autografi all’edizione a stampa”; Antonio Gargano, “L’*Arcadia* di Sannazaro in Spagna: l’*Egloga II* di Garcilaso tra *imitatio* e modello bucolico”; Piermario Vescovo, “‘La busca de Jacopo.’ Visualizzazione, letteratura applicata, teatro”; Adriana Mauriello, “Il codice arcadico nella cultura napoletana del Cinquecento”; Ornella Gonzalez y Reyero, “Dagli «exquisiti suono» di Sannazaro ai «carmini» di Mamfurio. La declinazione parodica del registro bucolico nel *Candelaio* di Giordano Bruno”; Giuseppina Scognamiglio, “Prolegomeni alla rappresentazione spirituale *Il parto della Vergine* di Marc’Antonio Perillo”; Cristiana Anna Adesso, “Sannazaro in Parnaso”; Vincenzo Caputo, “Biografie e immagini di Sannazaro: dalle vite cinquecentesche ai drammi ottocenteschi”; and Daniela De Liso, “Iacopo Sannazaro nella critica letteraria del secondo Ottocento.”

As one might expect, several of the essays in this volume are only lightly revised conference papers, but even these have been carefully annotated, and the majority of the contributions have been expanded noticeably for publication. Sannazaro deserves the attention he has been given here, as the author of major neo-Latin poems like *De partu virginis* and an important cycle of piscatory eclogues and as a major figure in Quattrocento Neapolitan culture. Unlike a good many volumes of conference proceedings being published in Italy these days, all the contributors to this one write in Italian, although in fairness it should be noted that not all live and teach in Italy (Olga Zorzi Pugliese, for example, taught for many years in Canada). And unlike some Italian *atti*, this one is enriched by two excellent indices, one of names and the other of works cited, that contribute enormously to its usefulness.

It is worth noting that this volume of conference proceedings represents the first step in an interuniversity, pan-European initiative sponsored by several journals: *Albertiana*, *Humanistica*, *Italique*, *Litteratura & Arte*, *Schifanoia*, *Sincronie*, *Studi rinascimentali*, and *Studiolo*. The focus of this initiative is the protagonists, places, and central moments of humanism and the Renaissance, with a focus on the connections between texts and authors and on mapping the circula-



tion of cultural capital at the origins of modern Europe. The cycle of international, interdisciplinary conferences unfolding here follows upon a first cycle dedicated to the connections between the arts in modern and contemporary times, “La scrittura dell’arte. Testi e immagini dall’Umanesimo al Novecento / L’écriture de l’art. Textes et images de l’Humanisme au XX<sup>e</sup> siècle,” Pisa-Naples-Paris, 2002 and 2003. At the time when these *atti* went to press, conferences in the new cycle had been held on Tasso (Rome, 3-6 May 2006), the age of Guidobaldo and Castiglione (Urbino, 15-16 June 2006), Boccaccio (Grenoble, 12-14 October 2006), dialogue in the era of humanism (Rennes, 15-17 November 2007), Ariosto (Ferrara, 12-15 December 2007), “Proportions” (Tours, 30 June-4 July 2008), and Vasari (Isernia, 10-12 December 2008). Still in the planning stages at that point were meetings on the geography of Petrarchism (Zürich, autumn 2009; Genoa, spring 2010; and Paris, autumn 2010), the Middle Ages and the Renaissance in historiography from the nineteenth to the twentieth centuries (Cassino, spring 2010), and Angevins and Aragonese in Mediterranean civilization (Naples-Aix en Provence-Barcelona, 2011-2012). Presumably the proceedings of many, if not all, of these conferences will be published as well. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Francesco Rocciolos Mutineis. Interpretation und Kommentar.* By Thomas Haye. *Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies*, 12. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2009. 307 pp. 68 euros. In 2006, Thomas Haye presented the first edition (*Die Mutineis des Francesco Rocciolo. Ein lateinisches Epos der Renaissance*, *Noctes Neolatinae*, 6, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag) of the almost-forgotten neo-Latin epic *Mutineis* by the Italian humanist Francesco Rocciolo (d. 1528), a poetic elaboration of the eventful history of Rocciolo’s hometown, Modena, between 1510 and 1517. To this Haye now adds a volume containing criticism and explication, making the text more accessible for scholars from various fields of research such as history, classics, Italian literature, and theology. This is—as Haye states in his foreword—especially important for the *Mutineis*, as the text is characterized by sometimes-cryptic language and many

allusions to events and persons of contemporary regional history which not every reader might be familiar with.

The book is divided into two parts of roughly the same length. In the first part Haye uses an aspect-based approach to the text, in contrast to the second part, where he comments on the text verse by verse.

In the first part, entitled "Interpretation and Systematic Evaluation," Haye looks at selected aspects of the epic at different levels of analysis. He presents twenty-one short chapters, each concentrating on a different aspect of the text and offering some detailed analyses of suitable relevant passages. These interpretations have no explicit methodological basis and they are not presented in a systematic way, but put together they form a fairly comprehensive overview of the epic, covering structural, linguistic, literary, intertextual, poetological, historical, and social perspectives.

One main focus is on the relations between the text and what could be called historical reality. For example, Haye describes how (and why) Rocociolo is biased in the selection of the historical events he renders, how much space he sometimes gives minor events while leaving out objectively important facts, and how he artfully distributes the subject matter over the twelve books (chs. 1 and 2). Looking at the microstructure of the epic, Haye also gives examples of Rocociolo's dramatic strategies when elaborating a specific historical fact (e.g., ch. 16, "The Image of the Germans," or ch. 19, "The Arrival of the Papal Troops"). Relating the text to contemporary social reality, Haye shows the interplay between Rocociolo's actual social position and his decisions regarding the text as well as the role he assigns himself in the epic (chs. 10 and 11).

Another main focus is on the relations of the *Mutineis* with other texts, especially of the epic genre: in ch. 12 Haye analyzes Rocociolo's employment of typically epic motifs, while ch. 20 concentrates more on the linguistic models from classical, medieval, and Renaissance epics that Rocociolo draws on. In ch. 21 Haye briefly illustrates different techniques for integrating these models into the text.

The second part is a classic *Stellenkommentar*. As many detailed explanations are already included in the first part of the book, the structure of the commentary is very clear and most of the comments

remain rather short, so that the reader is not distracted by digressions while reading the Latin text. It must be said, however, that for the reader starting from the Latin text, a lot of interesting and helpful information is not easily retrievable; an index listing the passages included in the interpretation part would have been helpful.

There are mainly two types of commentary. The first type gives background information on persons or historical facts, quoting from the glosses in the autograph and from a contemporary chronicle. The second, and most frequent, type points out the linguistic models which Rocciolo—consciously or not—has integrated into the individual verses.

It remains arguable, though—as in many commentaries of this type—how illuminating this listing of reference texts really is for the reader (apart from showing the vast textual knowledge that Rocciolo drew on, mostly quoting from memory; cf. p. 133). It would be interesting to see in what ways, using what techniques, and with what effects Rocciolo employed his linguistic and textual models. Some hints are given in the first part of the book, e.g., in ch. 21. Here examples of Rocciolo's "artful technique of montage" (134) are given, but the question about the rhetorical effects that Rocciolo might possibly have intended remains unanswered here, too. Even if this of course is not the main goal of Haye's book, some representative analyses from this literary-rhetorical point of view would have completed Haye's otherwise-comprehensive study.

Still, with this rich and versatile book Haye presents a very helpful instrument for those interested in entering the world of the *Mutineis* and of early sixteenth-century Modena, and Italy more generally. (Ursula Troeger, Universität Bonn)

◆ *Paraphrases on the Epistles to the Corinthians, Ephesians, Philip-  
pians, Colossians, Thessalonians.* By Desiderius Erasmus. Ed. by Robert D. Sider, trans. and annotated by Mechtilde O'Mara and Edward A. Phillips, Jr. Collected Works of Erasmus, 43. Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2009. xxvi + 538 pp. \$184. The works contained in this volume, part of the subseries on New Testament Scholarship in the Collected Works of Erasmus series, serve as a beginning and an end, after the tentative start offered by the

Romans paraphrase, of Erasmus's effort to provide paraphrases to all the 'genuine' Pauline epistles. For Erasmus the paraphrase served as an expansion and clarification of what Paul had written, an effort to make the good news more accessible by elaborating on Paul's thoughts and to make it more attractive by recasting it in a smoother and more embellished Latin style.

Inevitably, of course, the world and values of the paraphrast emerge as part of this process, and here is where much of the interest in these works today lies. They were begun in the last weeks of 1518 and finished quickly at the beginning of 1519, a time when Erasmus and his ideas were coming under increasing criticism by his colleagues in Louvain. His dedications, to Erard de la Marck, prince-bishop of Liège, and Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggi, the papal legate in London, reflect a growing desire for patronage on his part and for a safe haven in these conflicts. His commentary, too, is clearly driven by sixteenth-century concerns as well as Pauline ones. In the paraphrase of the letters to the Corinthians, for example, Erasmus returns to a theme familiar from his other writings, that discord is an evil arising from the passions that must be purified through faith and love, and to a subject that had also concerned him in his *Encomium on Marriage* (1518), that celibacy is praiseworthy but is only for those strong enough to endure in it. Here also he suggests that the gift of the tongues is, or should be, the gift of languages to be learned for the exposition of Scripture, a point that had come up repeatedly in his controversies with his colleagues in Louvain. In the Ephesians through 2 Thessalonians paraphrases, Erasmus stresses the image of the church as a body with Christ as head to which the members with their varied gifts are united, an image that proved central to his proclivity toward accommodation. Much of this is serious, as befits the importance of the subjects being treated, but Erasmus's sense of humor breaks through occasionally as well, as in the paraphrase on 1 Corinthians 3, where the fictional names of the divisive parties point with a certain derisive humor to the monastic orders of the paraphrast's day.

As is usual with volumes in the Collected Works of Erasmus series, the 1532 Froben text of the *Paraphrases*, the last published during Erasmus's lifetime with significant editorial revisions, has been translated here, although important variants from other important editions are

recorded in the annotations. These notes often exceed in length the text that accompanies them on the page and serve as a rich interpretive aid in themselves. Some of them point out sources and parallels for ideas (especially the patristic commentators ‘Ambrosiaster’ and Theophylact) and language (especially Aristotle and Cicero); others refer to related passages in different works of Erasmus’s (especially his *Annotations*). The translators have broken up some of the longer sentences that could not be recast successfully into English, but they have in general remained faithful to Erasmus’s style, especially in transferring the passages with rhetorical flourishes into a correspondingly high style in their translation. It should be noted that the back matter is especially thorough and useful, consisting of a list of the sequence and dates of the various paraphrases, two other lists of frequently cited works and of short-title forms for Erasmus’s writings, and five indices, of scriptural references, classical references, patristic and medieval references, Greek and Latin words cited, and general words and concepts. In the end someone doing serious work on Erasmus will still have to consult the original Latin, but with a translation of this calibre, much can be done, and the notes and back matter in fact serve as an important aid to understanding the Latin text as well as the translation. All in all, this volume constitutes another outstanding example of scholarship from this longstanding series. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Luther’s Whorely War, the Epigrams, and A Grievance to the Prince.* By Simon Lemnius. Trans. by Hubert W. Hawkins. The Poems of Simon Lemnius, 1. xvi + 400 pp. \$45. *The Amores of Simon Lemnius, Renegade Poet of the Reformation.* By Simon Lemnius. Trans. by Hubert W. Hawkins. The Poems of Simon Lemnius, 2. xii + 184 pp. Manquin, VA: Uppingham House, 2009. The two volumes under review here present a significant part of the poetic output of Simon Lemnius (1511-1550), a neo-Latin poet from the Romansch-speaking part of Switzerland whose work can compare with that of such established contemporaries as Joannes Secundus, Petrus Lotichius Secundus, and Veit Amerbach. Absent from these volumes are Lemnius’s *De bello Raetico*, an epic on the Swiss-Habsburg war of 1499 that was not published for almost 250 years after his death, and his five *Eclogues*,

which also appeared posthumously, nor do we find here his translation of Homer's *Odyssey*, which was the first Renaissance rendering into Latin hexameters. But what we do find are the poems upon which Lemnius's reputation rested during his lifetime. His epigrams carry the expected trapping of Greek gods and Roman heroes, rendered in a style that is generally chaste and restrained, occasionally elliptical, with an eye for natural detail but also with a pronounced interest in the human world of saltworks, dairying, and innkeeping. His elegies also begin where we would expect, in the world of the frustrated Roman lover, but Lemnius presents himself as more fickle than Propertius or Tibullus and embraces a coarseness that goes beyond what we find in his models. The other two works presented here were born from Lemnius's longstanding conflict with Luther. *A Grievance to the Prince* is a 344-line poem in elegiac distichs that expresses to Prince Albert, the Chancellor of the Holy Roman Empire, Lemnius's indignation at how Luther has treated him and appeals to him for support. *Luther's Whorely War* takes that indignation to an entirely different level, as a graphic dramatic rendering of Luther's household, showing his wife as a nymphomaniac and Luther as an impotent cuckold. The play degenerates into a middle section that has little discernible chronology or plot, but it comes complete with a chorus line of Babylonian courtesans and mixes physical explicitness with echoes of Ovid and Petrarch in such a way that it certainly merits a reading, provided one is not too squeamish.

There is much to commend here in the presentation of the poems and the accompanying translations. Hawkins did not prepare a critical text, but instead used either a sixteenth-century edition or texts prepared by Lothar Mundt, in both cases a perfectly good choice. The translations in many cases are quite remarkable. Hawkins has eschewed the easy path offered by a prose translation and has instead sought to preserve the timing, thought, images, and idiom of the original, in the original meters. This is a very difficult task indeed and requires a translator who is himself a respectable poet, especially since classical meters are notoriously difficult to reproduce in English. One example will suffice to show what Hawkins has accomplished:

Cur vites semper communia balnea, dicam:  
 Quod sis nigra, scio; quod scabiosa, puto.

May I suggest why you never go into the popular bath house:  
 That you are swarthy, I know; that you are scabby, I guess.

This is perfect, with the rhythm reproduced in English along with the movement of grammar and ideas. And it is typical: translation after translation, long and short, is just as successful.

The problem with these books lies with the introductions, especially to the first volume. As mentioned above, Lemnius had a longstanding feud with Luther, who without question got the best of the battle, with Lemnius's reputation suffering, probably unfairly, ever since then. Hawkins's avowed purpose is to rescue Lemnius's reputation. This is perfectly reasonable, but Hawkins chooses to do so by blackening Luther. Now to be sure, the historical Luther was far from perfect, and Hawkins starts off well enough. When he writes that Luther was "obsessed by folk conceptions of the devil, unceasingly disputatious in the casuistic tradition of the middle ages, confrontational by nature both in his personal relations and in his politics, generally dismissive of whatever opulent art, noble architecture, and cultural tradition the Roman church had to offer, and often contemptuous of poetry itself" (19), an open-minded reader must agree. But when Hawkins writes that Luther "ruled his *cult* [my emphasis], his town, and his university as a formidable dictator" (12), one suspects that this may end up going too far. And these suspicions are confirmed when we get conclusions like this one: "Luther and Melanchthon departed from humanism's ideal of free inquiry and *laid some of the foundations of modern fundamentalism*" (emphasis mine, 13), where the first phrase is certainly right but the second will strike most readers as overstated, to say the least. The attempt to argue that Luther wielded his powers of repression like Senator Joseph McCarthy (11) will again give most readers pause, as will the suggestion that a passage from one of his sermons is "[l]ike other vehement utterances that one finds in Luther's works ... so rambling and disjointed as to suggest the incoherency of a lunatic" (3-4). To be sure, there is plenty of space in historical method for practitioners to reach different conclusions,

but the historical method on which this introduction relies contains several questionable moves, ranging from a citation to Will Durant's book on the Reformation (!) to an effort to read back from a highly partisan work of literature like *Luther's Whorely War* to the historical 'facts' behind the events it depicts (16-17). Hawkins has fashioned this introduction as an assault on "the ongoing bigotry and fanaticism that still oppress our present world," but in a good number of places this goal has gotten in the way of sound, sensible scholarship.

The introduction, then, especially to the first volume, has some problems, but the rest of what Hawkins has done is first-rate. These books should be of interest both to scholars of neo-Latin poetry and to those who follow the ins and outs of Reformation politics, and I recommend them to readers in both groups. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Nugae-Bagatelles 1533*. Nicolas Bourbon. Édition critique, introduction et traduction par Sylvie Laigneau-Fontaine. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 446. Genève: Droz, 2008. 1063 pages. Sylvie Laigneau-Fontaine propose une édition critique des *Nugae* de Nicolas Bourbon dans leur version de 1533. Le texte et la traduction des 584 pièces (224-969) sont précédés d'une volumineuse introduction (9-194) ainsi que d'une partie du paratexte qui les accompagnait dans l'édition Cratander 1533 (201-223) : l'épigramme d'envoi à l'imprimeur bâlois Cratander (199) et la lettre préface adressée à un certain Lucius Stella, auquel est aussi dédiée l'épigramme 66 (297). En revanche, elle ne publie pas le poème sur les forges du père du poète intitulé *Ferraria*, ni tous les textes qui encadrent cette œuvre, mais seulement, en annexe (annexe 5, p. 1009-1012) et sans traduction, les lettres et poème qui figuraient après la *Ferraria*, auxquels elle se réfère. Il s'agit des lettres de Ludwig Kiel à Bourbon (1009-1010) et de Bourbon à Porcinus (1010-1012) et, enfin, du poème de Bourbon *Ad libellum suum* (1012). En annexe se trouvent aussi un *conspectus metrorum* (annexe 1, p. 973-974), les index des personnages et auteurs cités (annexe 2, p. 975-990), une concordance des épigrammes (annexe 3, p. 991-1004) et un aperçu général des différentes éditions et de leur paratexte (annexe 4, p. 1005-1008). Enfin, une vaste bibliographie clôt l'ouvrage (1017-1059).



Avec Nicolas Bourbon, Sylvie Laigneau-Fontaine s'est trouvé confrontée au cas d'un poète méconnu et méjugé pour lequel il y a tout à faire : édition scientifique et traduction d'une œuvre, qui n'est pas ou qui est peu accessible, étude littéraire qui lui restitue sa place dans la poésie néo-latine et dans la Renaissance française. Or, face à l'ampleur de la tâche et à son ambivalence, Sylvie Laigneau-Fontaine, loin de se décourager, a su mener à bien avec rigueur, exigence et persévérance ce double défi qui réclamait à la fois la finesse d'analyse du critique littéraire et la méthode scientifique de l'éditeur de texte, sans oublier non plus la précision et l'élégance du traducteur.

En effet, l'introduction de 185 pages ne se contente pas de situer l'homme et l'œuvre et de poser les principes d'édition, mais dégage le sens profond du texte et motive donc, par cette intelligence intime, les choix de l'éditeur. Ainsi une étude complète et détaillée de Bourbon et de ses *Nugae* parvient à montrer dans quelle exacte mesure ce prototype des poètes néo-latins de la Renaissance française, au pire déconsidéré, au mieux ignoré par les spécialistes de la littérature latine comme française—S. Laigneau rappelle les jugements de Lucien Febvre et de Verdun-Louis Saulnier, mais aussi déjà de ses contemporains, J. C. Scaliger et Du Bellay—mérite cependant, aujourd'hui encore, toute notre attention. En effet, au terme de ce travail, les *Nugae* de Bourbon ne nous apparaissent plus comme des Riens, mais se révèlent exprimer la foi de leur auteur—ô combien représentatif d'une époque (le premier Humanisme) et d'un milieu (évangélique budéen) !— en la vertu des *studia humanitatis*. Ces études, seules, seraient capables de produire une nouvelle civilisation, d'améliorer l'homme et la société et de rendre la religion chrétienne à la pureté évangélique avec la bénédiction du roi. Or cette signification profonde de l'œuvre permet de justifier, outre des considérations de volume, le choix d'éditer la version de 1533 plutôt que celle de 1538-1540, qui représente pourtant le dernier état du texte publié du vivant de l'auteur. En effet, ce rêve évangélique et humaniste porté par les *Nugae* n'a soulevé la France que dans le premier tiers du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle, si bien que, en 1538-1540, échaudé par l'expérience de la prison, Bourbon édulcore manifestement son dernier recueil, par prudence plus que par conviction. En l'occurrence, la dernière version publiée par l'auteur ne coïnciderait pas avec la dernière version voulue par lui. D'où le choix de S. Laigneau,

divergent de celui de Verdun-Louis Saulnier pour son anthologie, mais parfaitement conforme aux exigences scientifiques. Après avoir justifié le texte retenu, l'éditrice explique avec le même soin les versions qu'elle a conservées dans son appareil, ses choix concernant la graphie qui privilégient, autant que faire ce peut, l'usage de l'auteur, ainsi que sa décision de proposer une traduction en stiques, et parfois même en alexandrins, décasyllabes ou octosyllabes non rimés.

Elle confronte son édition de référence (Cratander 1533) aux *Epigrammata* de 1530 (Lyon, L. Hillaire) et aux trois autres éditions des *Nugae* (Paris, Vascosan, 1533; Lyon, Gryphe, 1538; Bâle, Cratander, 1540). En ce qui concerne l'établissement du texte, la doctrine suivie par S. Laigneau nous semble la bonne ; en particulier, il nous semble judicieux d'avoir suivi l'accentuation de l'édition, du même Cratander, de 1540, bien qu'elle ne fût pas son édition de référence, car elle a été la dernière publiée du vivant de l'auteur, et donc doit représenter ses ultimes choix en matière d'orthographe. Le lecteur apprécie la clarté de la présentation adoptée : l'apparat des sources séparé de l'apparat critique, sur la page de gauche où figure le texte latin. Le commentaire, sur la page de droite, en note de la traduction. Les notes sont numérotées en continu, mais l'affectation à chaque texte d'un numéro en gras, reporté à chaque début de séquence critique (apparat critique, apparat des sources ou du commentaire), facilite grandement le repérage. En revanche, plus discutable est le choix qui consiste à avoir attribué à toutes les pièces, quels que soient leurs genres, le nom d'épigramme, à moins qu'on ne considère ce genre comme englobant en l'occurrence tous les autres ; mais Bourbon lui-même a qualifié d'*ode* certaines de ses pièces (150, 489 et 526). L'apparat critique, positif, est avant tout un instrument de comparaison des versions. Quant à l'apparat des sources, il est commenté et souvent complété par les notes du commentaire en regard qui ajoute des parallèles avec des textes antiques, médiévaux et humanistes, en prose comme en vers. Cet enrichissement est intéressant, mais parfois il nous paraît que certaines références proposées dans le commentaire auraient eu leur place dans l'*apparatus fontium* au même titre que celles qui s'y trouvent. Le commentaire, savant, dénote un grand sens littéraire. En effet, S. Laigneau, y revient non seulement sur les sources et les parallèles de chaque pièce, mais elle en explicite systématiquement le contexte et en

précise les thèmes, fournissant toujours, à ce propos, une bibliographie pertinente et actualisée (on appréciera en particulier les nombreuses références aux données numérisées). Enfin, son commentaire nous fait pénétrer dans son atelier de traductrice. Il n'est pas rare qu'elle en profite pour signaler la présence d'un néologisme (par exemple *bullosus*, *Nug.* 239, v. 1, p. 515, n. 842) ou du remploi d'un hapax (*flagrio*, un emploi chez Afranius, *Com.* 391 : *Nug.* 240, v. 3, p. 515, n. 845). Elle discute du sens d'un mot ou d'une expression, en invoquant le témoignage des écrivains de toute l'Antiquité, grecque et latine, de Plaute aux néo-latins, ou l'autorité des instruments lexicographiques contemporains, comme le dictionnaire de R. Estienne. Elle déplore la trahison inévitable de toute traduction, incapable de tout rendre, quelle que soit la virtuosité du traducteur. Grâce à cette attention à la langue, S. Laigneau fait non seulement renaître le talent de Nicolas Bourbon, mais ressuscite aussi le latin dans toute son épaisseur et sa vitalité. Elle rend hommage par la justesse et la légèreté de sa version française des *Nugae* de N. Bourbon, mais aussi par la modestie et l'humilité avec lesquelles elle a abordé ce travail, à la splendeur de la *lingua latina*. (B. Charlet-Mesdjian, Université de Nice-Sophia-Antipolis)

◆ *Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda, Epistolario, Obras Completas VIII, IX,1 [Cartas 1-75 (1517-1548)] y IX,2 [Cartas 76-139 (1549-1567)]*. Edición crítica, traducción e introducción filológica de Ignacio J. García Pinilla y Julián Solana Pujalte, introducción histórica de Juan Gil. Excmo: Ayuntamiento de Pozoblanco, 2007. 3 vols., CDXXIII pp. (vol. VIII) + 412 pp. (vols. IX,1 y IX,2). Todo corpus epistolar nos permite conocer de primera mano las constantes biográficas y prosopográficas de su personaje central. Y si además consideramos que para el humanista Sepúlveda el principio de la *imitatio* es consustancial a la escritura de sus cartas, entenderemos el alcance comunicativo y estilístico de éstas, pero también la oportunidad de tan documentada edición.

Componen ya una impecable colección las obras de Sepúlveda que hasta la fecha han sido publicadas por la benefactora iniciativa del Ayuntamiento de Pozoblanco (Córdoba, España). Así, entre las obras más destacadas de quien fuera Secretario de cartas latinas de Carlos I, han aparecido los *Historiarum de rebus gestis Caroli V, Democrates secundus, De rebus gestis Philippi Regis Hispaniae libri, De regno libri III, Antapologia*

*pro Alberto Pio in Erasmum Roterodamum, Cohortatio ad carolum V y el De orbe novo.*

Ahora le toca el turno a su epistolario, para el que se han destinado estos tres sustanciosos volúmenes: el VIII está dedicado en su integridad a servir de introducción histórica y filológica del texto sepulvediano, verdadero *aureus ramus* para adentrarnos y navegar por tan enjundiosas como perspicuas resultan sus aguas, las que podemos leer en los dos restantes volúmenes IX1 y IX2. De recrear con amenísimo rigor el periplo vital e intelectual de Sepúlveda y de hacernos comprender su dimensión histórica se ha encargado el profesor Juan Gil, porque la edición y exhaustivo análisis filológico de los variados temas que conglutina este epistolario ha sido responsabilidad de los profesores García Pinilla y Solana Pujalte.

De impecable factura editorial, la disposición de sus componentes no ha podido ser más acertada. El volumen introductorio (VIII) tiene un grato sabor documental cuya lectura puede bastar en sí misma, pero su función es siempre complementaria guiando en todo momento la lectura, sea ordenada o aleatoria, de las cartas. En el sentido histórico se nos presentarán los principales corresponsales de este estudioso y valedor del aristotelismo renacentista, sus estancias siguiendo a la corte imperial y tratos con príncipes italianos como Alberto Pío de Carpi o Hércules Gonzaga de Mantua, con los colegas españoles en Bolonia (Antonio Agustín) o con otros españoles en Roma (los hermanos Valdés, cardenales, embajadores). También se ofrecen el contenido y sentido de sus polémicas teológicofilológicas con Erasmo y Hernán Núñez o con los dominicos (Las Casas y Melchor Cano), contextualizado en unos tiempos difíciles (Ep. 41 y 50) marcados por el saco de Roma, el cisma luterano y el Concilio de Trento, pero donde también tienen cabida asuntos de espionaje en la Corte y en la Curia (Ep. 48) y ricas anécdotas de la vida cotidiana (Ep. 24). Todo va rematado por los principales rasgos de Sepúlveda que nos descubren sus cartas (unión de la teología con las humanidades, su helenismo, deseo de soledad y vida retirada en contraste con la actividad cortesana y los viajes, etc.), más un completo ejemplario de su estilo y latinidad.

Su estudio filológico nos relata la peripecia editorial seguida por la colección y un seguimiento pormenorizado de sus temas, principalmente los polémicos con Erasmo sobre cuestiones bíblicas y

con el Pinciano sobre filología, también sobre filosofía y sobre la licitud de la conquista de Indias, etc. No se olvidan sus editores de los imprescindibles principios ecdóticos seguidos, del análisis de los diversos estados y variantes textuales, criterios gráficos y bibliografía. Cierran este primer volumen dos índices tan útiles como necesarios: onomástico y de fuentes, válidos para este volumen isagógico como para los otros dos de las epístolas.

Tan sabia y entretenida *isagogé* sólo tiene sentido como antesala de la sosegada lectura que reclaman estas estilizadas cartas latinas de temática preferentemente literaria. (Felipe González Vega, Universidad del País Vasco)

◆ *De uno. Sobre lo uno.* By Girolamo Cardano. Ed., trans., and commented upon by José Manuel García Valverde. Hyperchen: Testi e studi per la storia della cultura del Rinascimento, 3. Florence: Casa editrice Leo S. Olschki, 2009. xlv + 63 pp. 16 euros. This is the third volume within the recently launched series Hyperchen. As with its predecessors, the book under review is a critical edition and translation of a work by the Italian philosopher, mathematician, and astrologer Girolamo Cardano (1501-1576). Written around 1560 and first published in Basle in 1562, Cardano's short treatise *De uno* (*On the One*) was recommended by the author as introductory reading material to three of his larger and more complex texts (the *Dialectica*, the *Theonoston*, and the *De arcanis aeternitatis*). In his booklet Cardano develops his notion of unity: he argues that everything that exists is one, so that the structure of unity is identical to the structure of reality. Arising from God's simple and necessary unity is, for Cardano, an *ordo universalis* which is structured according to a hierarchy. Every real being can properly be regarded as a system constituted by a certain number of organic parts that cooperate in function. As a result, reality is reduced to a system of functions in which every individual being is at the same time an organ or subsystem of its supersystem and the superior unit of its subsystems.

García Valverde's edition has been carried out to the highest imaginable standards. His lengthy preliminary remarks are divided into three parts, in which the editor begins by summarizing the contents of Cardano's treatise. There follows a detailed analysis of Cardano's

theology. In this section García Valverde concludes that underlying Cardano's scheme in which "everything originates from the One" (xliii) is a certain form of pantheism. The closing pages to the introduction describe the editorial criteria employed by García Valverde. Rather than simply reproducing the Basle edition of 1562 (reprinted in the same city twenty-three years later), the editor painstakingly notes all those cases in which the text of the *editio princeps* diverges from that brought to the press by Charles Spon in Lyon in 1663 as part of Cardano's *Opera omnia*. This is particularly valuable since Spon's edition has been until now the text with which most readers have accessed Cardano's works. But this detail is not the only virtue of the volume prepared by García Valverde. His Spanish translation is close to the original Latin without falling into pedestrian and extreme literality, and is above all rewarding to readers who must come to Cardano only in translation. The thorough notes help clarify the occasionally complex concepts discussed by Cardano, identify the sources to the *De uno* (Aristotle, Plotinus, Avicenna), and draw parallels and cross-references with the rest of Cardano's philosophical corpus. A bibliography and an index of names complete the volume. Seemingly (and justifiably) more interested in the contents of the *De uno* than in Cardano's eventful life and colorful personality, García Valverde spares his readers biographical details about the author and information about the context in which Cardano's work arose. This should not, however, detract from the usefulness of this edition, which makes available a complex, yet important, sample of Renaissance philosophical thought to a wide readership. García Valverde has done scholars interested in the history of early modern philosophy a service by providing the text and translation of a treatise that has been rather neglected up to now. In addition, the publisher, Olschki, is to be congratulated on its decision to start the Hyperchen series with editions of Cardano's corpus. (Alejandro Coroleu, ICREA—Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

◆ *De recta pronuntiatione Latinae linguae dialogus*. By Iustus Lipsius. Ed., translated into French, and commented upon by Elisabeth Dévière. *Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies*, 7. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2007. xxv

+ 345 + [1] pp. Sir Philip Sidney and Justus Lipsius probably met for the first time when the English courtier and diplomat passed through Leuven on his way to the imperial court, in March, 1577. In the following years Lipsius, who was by then teaching Latin and ancient history at Leiden University, maintained the relationship by sending him occasional regards in letters to friends on a mission at the English court. When Queen Elizabeth appointed Sidney governor of Flushing, one of the strategic Dutch coastal cities acquired in August, 1585 as a pledge against England's military and financial support to the Northern Low Countries, their contacts surely became more frequent, since Sidney was not only a diplomat and a politician, but also an excellent poet with a flair for languages. On a visit to Leiden in the company of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, he attended one of Lipsius's lectures on Tacitus's *Agricola*. By the end of 1585 he must have asked the scholar about his views on the pronunciation of Latin, in particular whether the pronunciation of the language as they spoke it varied with that of classical times. The promised essay quickly grew into a booklet, which Franciscus Raphelengius, son-in-law and successor of Christopher Plantin in Leiden, published just in time for Frankfurt's spring book fair in 1586. Soon afterward Sidney was hit in a skirmish with some Spanish troops and died in Arnhem some weeks later, on 17 October.

Although *De recta pronuntiatione* was definitely not the most successful of Lipsius's works, it was reprinted in due course when Johannes Moretus, another son-in-law of Plantin and his successor in Antwerp, or his son Balthasar was running out of stock. (Dévière does not mention the two Moretus editions of the *Opera omnia* in 1614 (vol. 1) and 1637 (vol. 1), nor the 1609 reprint (vol. 1) of the Lyonese edition of 1611, printed by Horace Cardon.) Dévière's edition is, in fact, the first since the seventeenth century. French translation and Latin text are put on opposing pages. Dévière has chosen to follow the 1599 version, still containing slight alterations made by Lipsius; as explained in the introduction (sub *ratio edendi*), this respects Lipsius's use of small capitals and italics, but silently introduces modern orthography and punctuation. As the Latin version is obviously shorter than any translation, this offers the opportunity to add three apparatuses at the bottom of the page. The first gives what are marginal annota-

tions in Lipsius's text (except for the *argumenta*, the key words of the argumentation, allowing the reader a quick browse through previous or succeeding passages). The second is the *apparatus criticus*, which wisely omits possible variants in punctuation or the use of capitals, thus emphasizing the truly important ones. The third is the *apparatus fontium*, fully identifying the numerous references or allusions marked less precisely in the original text. Dévière has done an excellent job both in her edition and in her translation, for Lipsius's often-pithy language can be hard to understand. Moreover, small numerals in the translation refer the reader to the second part of the book, consisting of an extensive number of annotations, gathered by chapter. Here each chapter opens with a summary of its main points. The remarks deal with particulars about vocabulary, grammar, or style, they add further references to ancient sources or the use of proverbs, they occasionally refer the reader to corresponding passages in the treatise, and they offer more detailed information on ancient or modern authors and their works, or on particular customs in antiquity. Time and again, Lipsius's theories are confronted with those of his predecessors in the field, be they from antiquity or the early Renaissance (in particular Erasmus and Van Meetkerken), and they are also compared with the views of modern linguists.

A minor disappointment in this book is the introduction. In the first section, on Lipsius's life and works, the editor contents herself with enumerating a few possible sources, albeit not always the most recent ones: she should certainly have mentioned the articles in the *Biographie nationale* and, more recently, the *Nationaal biografisch woordenboek*, or *The World of Justus Lipsius* (Brussels-Rome, 1998), edited by Marc Laureys. She might have completed the reference to Lipsius's autobiographical letter by referring to its modern edition in *ILE* [= *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*], XIII, 00 10 01 (Brussels, 2000). She might also have taken a closer look into the correspondence between both protagonists, all published in *ILE* II (Brussels, 1983), instead of mostly using a secondary source. In that case, she might have understood that Sidney, who was aware of Lipsius's increasing weariness about staying in Leiden, merely suggested to him that he remain in England, not that "Lipse espérait obtenir une chaire en Angleterre par leur entreprise" (xvii—he never thought of going to England, but longed



to return to his native country). Moreover, there is the matter of the dedication and the title page, on which the name of the dedicatee was explicitly mentioned: *Ad Virum Illustrem Philippum Sidneium, Equitem*. As usual with Lipsius's publications in Leiden, half of the issue was provided with a title page having the Antwerp address and destined for Catholic countries. Imagine the consternation of Plantin (who had hardly returned to the Catholic South after a two years' stay in Leiden) when he became aware that one of the first books sent to him by Raphelengius combined his name with that of a Protestant, a confidant of the queen of England! He immediately started to have the dedication cut out of a number of copies and wrote letters to the ecclesiastical authorities, asking them whether he would be allowed to sell these copies, despite the notorious name, which could not be erased from the title page.... Fortunately, the censor did not find one bad word against the Church or the Spanish king (his handwritten  *censura*  still exists) and approved the sale of the work. Nevertheless, in most of the 'Antwerp' copies the quire with the dedication is lacking. In the following re-issues, however, it was included, although the title page no longer mentioned the address to Sidney. (Jeanine De Landtsheer, KUL)

◆ *Introduction à la lecture de Sénèque (1586)*. Ed. and trans. by Denise Carabin. Textes de la Renaissance, 109. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2007. 530 pp. 143.36 euros. In 1586, Henri Estienne found himself, with his family's press, in Calvinist Geneva. As one of Europe's most famous humanist printers, he wanted to publish an edition of Seneca, but Muret beat him to it, bringing out an edition in Rome that was expanded some time later by Nicolas Le Fèvre and then reprinted in Paris. Nevertheless interest in Seneca remained substantial, as part of the rediscovery and rehabilitation of this author in the Renaissance. Beginning with the 1515 and 1529 editions of Erasmus, sixteenth-century scholarship gradually settled on a philosopher who was not Christian but whose ideas were compatible with Christianity, then on a stylist who was not inferior to Cicero but different from and complementary to him. Estienne decided that so long as scholars like Lipsius continued to praise Muret's edition, there was no market for

a competitor, but an introduction to Seneca would sell. That is the work under review here.

The originality of Estienne's text lies in its erudition, for the author drew on the command of the Greek and Latin languages that supported his famous dictionaries, along with a broad knowledge of other relevant works in the ancient philosophical tradition, to produce a preface for Seneca's learned readers. The first part focuses on Seneca as a Stoic philosopher, situating Stoicism within the broader development of philosophy in ancient Rome, then showing how Seneca developed his thought within Stoic parameters, with sections on such key Stoic themes as the parts of the soul, the birth of the passions, paradoxes, the tranquility of the soul, wisdom, and so forth. Book 2 is devoted to word choice, sentence structure, and stylistic refinement in Seneca. Here again the discussion is broadly based, placing Seneca first among ancient writers on style like Cicero, Quintilian, Demetrius, and Longinus, then drawing on the ideas of Erasmus, Melanchthon, Ramus, and Sturm. Estienne freely acknowledges Seneca's fondness for brevity, even filling out sample passages to aid readers more accustomed to a fuller Ciceronian style, but he insists that Seneca's manner of writing is appropriate to his ideas, with his characteristic ellipses, questions, and commands providing a stylistic dynamism that supports the ideas he is trying to get across.

As Carabin notes, this work has received little attention over the years. It is not part of the regular scholarly interchange among Estienne's contemporaries, and we have to wait almost three centuries for it to make its way into the catalogues of his publications and the intellectual biographies that have disseminated information about Estienne and his writings. The publication in 2003 of *La France des Humanistes: Henri II Estienne éditeur et écrivain*, by Judit Kesckemeti, Hélène Cazes, and Bénédicte Boudou (Turnhout, Brepols) has facilitated the study of Estienne's prefaces and focused attention on works like the one being reviewed here. Carabin has not provided a critical edition but simply gone to the 1586 text, eliminating the letters about Seneca sent by Estienne to Dalechamp and adding a translation. The presentation of material is good, being noticeably free of problems that often plague projects like this, such as errors in the Greek and translations that do not match up with the Latin text on the facing page. There is

also a helpful bibliography and index of names. All in all, for anyone interested in the reception of ancient philosophy in the Renaissance or in the stylistic debates of the period, this is a useful book. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *La vie de Jacques-Auguste de Thou, I ; Aug. Thuani vita.* Jacques-Auguste de Thou. Introduction, établissement du texte et notes par Anne Teissier-Esminger. Paris: Champion, 2007. 1081 p. Il faut remercier Anne Teissier-Esminger de mettre à la disposition d'un public amateur d'histoire, de droit et de littérature une édition critique de *La vie de Jacques-Auguste de Thou*. Le texte de ce magistrat historien (1553-1617), qui fut lié à Henri IV et qui joua un rôle de négociateur pendant la régence de Marie de Médicis, méritait d'être présenté de façon savante, tant les éclaircissements sont nécessaires. On lira ainsi un document capital pour qui veut comprendre la France de la seconde moitié du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle.

Un apparat critique offre, sur la page de gauche, au bas du texte latin, les variantes des manuscrits (qui portent des titres différents), désignés par les lettres A (l'autographe), M, S, R et T. La traduction, quant à elle, est accompagnée de nombreuses notes qui donnent de précieux éclaircissements et qui rectifient les erreurs lorsque l'auteur en commet. Ainsi, p. 505, alors que de Thou mentionne le pape Benoît XI, Anne Teissier-Esminger précise qu'il s'agit en réalité de Grégoire XI. La biographie de personnages célèbres en leur temps, mais peu connus aujourd'hui sinon des spécialistes, est donnée en quelques lignes : c'est le cas, par exemple, p. 541 lorsqu'est évoqué le « célèbre orateur du roi de France », François Panigarola. Le fonctionnement de l'Etat est l'objet d'un petit développement quand de Thou évoque son entrée au Conseil du Roi, p. 639. Une mise au point sur la concurrence entre le français et le gascon, à propos de Du Bartas, est faite, p. 717. On pourrait multiplier les exemples dans nombre de domaines. C'est que l'œuvre est à situer dans la tradition encyclopédique des savants humanistes. Les sujets abordés sont extrêmement divers (il est question, entre autres, de zoologie, de magie).

Les poèmes qui avaient été supprimés de certaines éditions ont été rétablis. Ainsi, p. 577, *À Charles Cardinal de Vendôme* : aux notes historiques, fort utiles, on eût pu ajouter que ce texte qui traite des

guerres civiles, est d'inspiration lucanienne. On apprécie particulièrement, p. 956-959, la prosopopée de Rabelais qui met l'accent sur le rire.

La traduction de cette prose assez simple est fort bien rendue et permettra aux lecteurs non latinistes de goûter ces mémoires à la troisième personne qui font revivre une époque riche en événements.

Une copieuse introduction (9-184) fait le point sur l'histoire du texte (« Les énigmes d'un texte qui s'avance masqué ») et sur sa nature (« La mémoire en procès de l'historien de Thou »). On en retiendra que cette *Vita*, fictivement écrite par un ami, tient du témoignage et du plaidoyer et qu'elle est à lire en complément de l'*Historia*. À la fin, un résumé analytique orientera aisément le lecteur dans ces six livres. Il est suivi d'un *memento* généalogique, d'un synopsis métrique, d'un récapitulatif des itinéraires (1570-1598), d'un index des noms de personnes et d'un index des noms de lieux. Un seul regret, de peu de poids au regard des qualités de ce travail, est à formuler, l'absence de bibliographie.

On voit donc qu'Anne Teissier-Ensminger nous offre une belle édition où la rigueur philologique le dispute à l'érudition. (Jean-Claude Ternaux, Université de Reims)