



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

FALL - WINTER 2006

Vol. 64

Nos. 3&4

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 54, Nos. 3&4

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 64, Nos. 3&4

FALL-WINTER, 2006

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

University of Akron
Oklahoma State University
Texas A&M University

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

SUBSCRIPTIONS, Domestic and International. \$20.00 (\$25.00) for one year; \$35.00 (\$45.00) for two years; \$50.00 (\$65.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*. A current style sheet, announcements, previous volumes' Tables of Contents, advertising rates, and other information all may be obtained via our home page on the World Wide Web. Books for review and queries should be sent to:

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

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

ISSN 0037-3028

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON
Texas A&M University

EDITOR EMERITUS

Harrison T. Meserole
Texas A&M University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

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

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS

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

CONTENTS

VOLUME 64, NOS. 3&4 FALL-WINTER, 2006

REVIEWS

- Charles W.A. Prior, *Defining the Jacobean Church: the Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603-1625*. Review by GRAHAM PARRY 151
- James D. Tracy and Marguerite Ragnow, eds., *Religion and the Early Modern State: Views From China, Russia, and the West*.
Review by GALINA I. YERMOLENKO 154
- Anthony Milton, ed., *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618-1619)*. Review by JONATHAN WRIGHT 158
- Martin Mulrow and Jan Rohls, eds., *Socinianism and Arminianism. Antitrinitarians, Calvinists and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe*.
Review by MARIAN HILLAR 160
- Brent Nelson, *Holy Ambition: Rhetoric, Courtship, and Devotion in the Sermons of John Donne*. Review by RICHARD TODD 165
- Matthew Reynolds, *Godly Reformers and their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich*. Review by GEOFF BAKER 168
- Lyn Bennett, *Women Writing of Divinest Things: Rhetoric and the Poetry of Pembroke, Wroth and Lanyer*. Review by FRANCES TEAGUE 172
- Hero Chalmers, *Royalist Women Writers 1650-1689*.
Review by ELIZABETH CLARKE 174
- Jason R. Rosenblatt, *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi: John Selden*.
Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL 176
- Paul Cefalu, *Moral Identity in Early Modern English Literature*.
Review by GARY KUCHAR 179
- Stephen A. McKnight, *The Religious Foundations of Francis Bacon's Thought*.
Review by STEVEN MATTHEWS 183

Susan C. Staub, <i>Nature's Cruel Stepdames: Murderous Women in the Street Literature of Seventeenth Century England</i> . Review by SARAH SCOTT	187
Francis J. Bremer and Lynn A. Botelho, eds., <i>The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England 1588-1649</i> . Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK	189
David A. Weir, <i>Early New England: A Covenanted Society</i> . Review by JANET MOORE LINDMAN	192
Virginia Mason Vaughan, <i>Performing Blackness on English Stages, 1500-1800</i> . Review by NANCY M. BUNKER	194
Gary Kuchar, <i>Divine Subjection: The Rhetoric of Sacramental Devotion in Early Modern England</i> . Review by KATE NARVESON	198
Jan P. Hogendijk and Abdelhamid I. Sabra, eds., <i>The Enterprise of Science in Islam. New Perspectives</i> . Review by DARIN HAYTON	201
Robert Appelbaum and John Wood Sweet, eds., <i>Envisioning an English Empire: Jamestown and the Making of the North Atlantic World</i> . Review by JANET MOORE LINDMAN	204
Phil Withington, <i>The Politics of Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England</i> . Review by SIMON KOW	207
Michael Losonsky, <i>Enlightenment and Action from Descartes to Kant: Passionate Thought</i> . Review by JOSEPH M. MCCARTHY	210
Catherine Gimelli Martin, ed., <i>Milton and Gender</i> . Review by JULIA M. WALKER	212
Michael Lieb, <i>Theological Milton: Deity, Discourse, and Heresy in the Miltonic Canon</i> . Review by LARRY ISITT	216
Ernan McMullin, ed., <i>The Church and Galileo</i> . Review by LUCIANO BOSCHIERO	219
Massimo Turatto, Stefano Benetti, Luca Zampieri, William Shea, eds., <i>1604-2004: Supernovae as Cosmological Lighthouses</i> . Review by ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA	222
Charles-Alphonse Dufresnoy, <i>De Arte Graphica (Paris, 1668)</i> . Edition, translation and commentary by Christopher Allen, Yasmin Haskell, and Frances Muecke. Review by JOHN A. GALLUCCI	226
Charles M. Natoli, <i>Fire in the Dark: Essays on Pascal's Pensées and Provinciales</i> . Review by SUSAN READ BAKER	228

Georges Forestier, <i>Essai de génétique théâtrale: Corneille à l'oeuvre.</i> Review by JOHN D. LYONS	231
Ludvine Goupillaud, <i>De l'or de Virgile aux ors de Versailles: Métamorphoses de l'épopée dans la seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle en France.</i> Review by TOM CONLEY	234
Paul Crenshaw, <i>Rembrandt's Bankruptcy: The Artist, His Patrons, and the Art Market in Seventeenth-Century Netherlands.</i> Review by H. PERRY CHAPMAN	236
D.W. Hayton. <i>Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians and Parties.</i> Review by KAY J. BLALOCK.....	240
Debra Meyers, <i>Common Whores, Vertuous Women and Loveing Wives.</i> Review by MARTHA OBERLE	243
Susan J. Barnes, Nora De Poorter, Oliver Millar, Horst Vey, eds. <i>Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings.</i> Review by MAUREEN E. MULVIHILL	246
ESSAY	249

Dung-Carters and Holy Avarice
in Edward Taylor's "Meditation 1.46."
by William J. Scheick

NEO-LATIN NEWS	255
----------------------	-----

Charles W.A. Prior. *Defining the Jacobean Church: the Politics of Religious Controversy, 1603-1625*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. xiv + 294 pp. \$85.00. Review by GRAHAM PARRY, UNIVERSITY OF YORK.

Defining the Jacobean Church is a considerable addition to the flourishing literature on the early Stuart Church, for it offers a new angle on the current debate about the causes of division, shifting the bias away from theological disagreements to questions of ecclesiastical government. Recent writing about religious ideology in early Stuart England has tended to emphasise the theological conflict between Calvinism and Arminianism as the main cause of division in the Church, with prominent arguments over predestination and the role of the sacraments, but Charles Prior maintains that the chief concerns of most clerics who engaged in religious controversy were not those relating to ways of salvation, but issues of governance, rites and liturgy that arose from the sovereignty exercised by the Crown over the Church. A formidable body of writing about the ideal condition of the Church was published, but as Anthony Milton remarked in his important book *Catholic and Reformed* (1995), “the greater proportion of printed religious literature of the period 1600-40 remains almost wholly unstudied, and much historiographical debate has focused on a tiny sample of surviving material.” Prior has made some inroads into this *terra incognita* and encountered a number of little-known clerics “who, like Salamanders, lived in the fire of controversy.” Their disputes were always on the same overlapping topics: What are the historical evidences for the practices of reformed Protestants? Can precedents be found in the Gospels, in the letters of the Apostles, in the worship of the early Church, in the statements of the Fathers? Do Old Testament models of government by kings, priests and judges still have a prescriptive force in a modern ecclesiastical polity? What arguments can be advanced for the superiority of episcopal rule over presbyterian rule? How far is it permissible for the secular authority to assert itself in religious matters? Since the supreme governor of the Church of England was the monarch, religious questions always had political implications. The monarch wanted uniformity of belief and practice in order to maintain political stability and minimize opportunities for popular discontent, yet private conscience could prove stronger than the law in these matters, and no official pronouncements could ever produce a broad consensus.

King James did his best to settle the affairs of the Church of England by convening a conference at Hampton Court less than a year after his accession. He summoned the bishops and the leaders of the Puritans to consider demands and petitions for the further reform of the doctrine and discipline of the Church. The Puritans were frustrated in their hopes, for the Canons of 1604, which were the principal doctrinal outcome of the conference and which were drawn up under the control of Bishop Richard Bancroft, affirmed the concept of a Church in which matters of governance, doctrine and worship were subject to the political control of the Crown and Parliament. Ministers of the Church were obliged to subscribe to these Canons, along with the articles of faith. The Canons gave a focus to arguments that had been running since the Marprelate controversies of the 1580s and provoked further controversies which would shake the ecclesiastical scene for the whole of James's reign, continuing with increasing bitterness and divisiveness until the outbreak of civil war. Defining the nature of the Church was the central issue. Was it a divinely ordained institution shaped by scriptural example, independent of secular authority, guided by godly ministers, or was it a hierarchical system governed by bishops in which the practices were determined by a mixture of tradition and political expediency?

The figures that Prior leads out of obscurity bring learning, passion and prejudice to their cause in equal measure. Conformists, who supported the establishment position, refuted Reformists, who wanted change and freedom from secular control, and who in turn confuted their opponents by exposing the unsatisfactory compromise that was Hooker's *via media* and Herbert's Church of "fine aspect and fit array."

The High Commission, a prerogative court which could administer punishments independently of the common law, and which was an instrument for the enforcement of conformity, was a particular target of the Reformists. It was an ecclesiastical mantrap. John Burges, a nonconformist Lincolnshire minister who preached before James in July 1604 and used the occasion to attack the ceremonies enjoined by the Canons of 1604, was promptly deprived of his living and imprisoned, thanks to the High Commission. Ceremonies were the site of ceaseless contention in this period, with the justifications for and against constantly rehearsed. The Old Testament was at odds with the New on this question, for the OT was rich in ceremonies, and the

NT sparse. Did Christ make ceremonies redundant, or did they remain part of the usable tradition of the Church?

The 1604 Canons upheld ceremonies, but that did not put an end to disputes. Take kneeling to receive communion, for example. The Canons enjoined kneeling, but some ministers objected that kneeling was a tradition inherited from the Church of Rome; the Gospels state that Christ sat with his disciples at the Last Supper, and so communion should be received in a sitting position. Historically acute scholars pointed out that it was customary to recline at dinner at the time of Christ, and Josephus had indicated that the ancient Jews took their meals in a recumbent position. Others argued for standing, leaning or walking: all had some precedent or justification. Conformists maintained that the Catholic tradition of kneeling had become idolatrous by paying homage to the altar or to the Eucharist, but it could be reformed by a recognition that kneeling showed reverence to the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. The governors of the Jacobean Church wanted conformity, but in crucial matters of conscience such as how to receive communion, they were up against resolute resistance from many ministers and laymen who had good reasons to protest. Similar arguments went on about the use of the cross in baptism, or the wearing of surplices. Were these matters indifferent, *adiaphora*, about which every Church was entitled to make non-prescriptive decisions according to fitness, decency, or custom, or were they matters central to faith which had to be precisely determined and enforced?

Always the debates came back to the question of governance. The Jacobean Church sought to define itself by means of its Prayer Book, its articles and canons, and by the pronouncements of its bishops and most articulate clergymen, who were intent on refining the Elizabethan reconstruction so that it could establish itself confidently as a national Church of a unique kind, preserving what were considered to be the essential doctrines of Christian faith expressed in practices that were broadly acceptable to the English people, practices that acknowledged the modifying effects of time and tradition on ancient beliefs. It incorporated the monarch for its political protection, because its existence aroused the enmity of foreign nations, yet the monarch needed its support for the stable ordering of the country. Such a Church was indeed a peculiar institution, and it needed exceptional ingenuity, learning and even casuistry for its vindication and defence. It had to be defended against

Catholics and vindicated to Reformist Protestants, who had as much learning and even more passion than the establishment men. The illuminating illustration of the debates between exponents of differing Protestant convictions is the achievement of Prior's book. He captures the vigour of the antagonists, and we acquire a vivid understanding of the scale, complexity, intensity and duration of these debates. Prior makes us listen to many new and unfamiliar voices, such as those of Thomas Bell, William Bradshaw, Samuel Hieron, William Covell, John Gordon—though it would be helpful to have more information about the background of these men, their education and affiliations—and we come to realise that many of the debates that destabilised the Church in the reign of King Charles had been running for decades. There was a large audience and no shortage of participants—and no acceptable solutions, apart from the separation of the discontented from the state Church.

In his last chapter, Prior enlarges his scope to consider how King James attempted to exert control over the Presbyterian Kirk of his native Scotland. We have heard much in recent years about King Charles's disastrous efforts to impose uniformity of governance and worship on Scotland, so Prior's account of James's tentative moves in this direction, and the furious reactions in print they aroused, is an especially helpful preview to the even more violent dissensions of the 1630s which finally pushed religious conflict into war.

James D. Tracy and Marguerite Ragnow, eds. *Religion and the Early Modern State: Views From China, Russia, and the West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. x + 415 pp. \$85.00. Review by GALINA I. YERMOLENKO, DESALES UNIVERSITY.

This collection of thirteen essays—which sprang out of a conference organized by the Center of Early Modern History at the University of Minnesota—brings together views of American, British, and Dutch historians on early modern religious reforms and dissent across the European and Asian continents. The selection of essays represents several new approaches to the Protestant Reformation in modern-day historiography: namely, that it was not a rapid process carried out by the state, but rather a gradual process shaped to a large extent by common people; that religious beliefs and tensions contributed greatly to the formation of early modern group identities, par-

ticularly those of grassroots and minorities; and that more stress should be put on the role of religious communities in these processes, rather than on religious individualism, which had been emphasized (and much overrated) by the earlier historiography. These new notions are applied not only to English, French, Dutch, and German Protestantisms, but also to seventeenth-century religious dissent in several non-western countries, such as China, Ukraine, and Russia.

The essays in the first part of the volume, *Lived Religion and Official Religion*, closely study the relations between the governments and clerical authorities, on the one hand, and the common people, on the other, in religious conflicts of China, Russia, Holland, and England. Caroline Litzenberger's essay examines this relationship by tracing the reformation of communal ritual in early modern England. The author concludes that "the enforcement of religious change was a multilayered, multidimensional process involving people at all levels in church, state, and society" and that "layers of response to religious change . . . included disclosure and concealment, as well as nuanced responses" (118). While the change was initiated from above, local ritual manifestations frequently resulted from a collaborative struggle between the powerful and the powerless. Robert Crummy's essay, "Ecclesiastical Elites and Popular Belief and Practice in Seventeenth-Century Russia," reflects "on the most important phases of the interaction between the leaders of Russian Orthodoxy and ordinary parishioners between the late 1630s and the beginning of the eighteenth century in light of recent studies of Christian communities elsewhere in early modern Europe" (52).

The essays in the second part, *Forms of Religious Identity*, explore the impact of shared beliefs and practices on group identities in early modern China, Russia, France, and England. Frank Sysyn's essay, "Orthodoxy and Revolt: The Role of Religion in the Seventeenth-Century Ukrainian Uprising against the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth," shows the ideological role of the Orthodox faith in the Khmelnytskyi uprising of 1648. In the face of increasing conversion of Ukrainian nobles to Polish Catholicism, the Orthodox Church legitimized the revolt of its staunch supporters, Ukrainian (Zaporozhian) Cossacks, who were largely represented by peasants and lower classes (177). Sysyn believes that the Orthodox issue also played a major role in the Ukrainian Cossacks' swearing of allegiance to the Muscovy tsar in the aftermath of the revolt and in the subsequent redefining of the Ukrainian (or

Ruthenian) identity as part of an Orthodox East Slavic people. Raymond Mentzer's essay, "The Huguenot Minority in early Modern France," demonstrates how the new Protestant spirituality set the Huguenot community apart from the mainstream Catholic community in seventeenth-century France, and how it shaped their struggles in a hostile environment. The Huguenot experience confirms the strong impact of religious belief on a group, since there was no ethnic or cultural difference between them and the French Catholics.

The third part, *The Social Articulation of Belief*, analyzes the ways religious beliefs were shaped by specific contexts. For instance, Eve Levin's essay, "False Miracles and Unattested Dead Bodies: Investigations into Popular Cults in early Modern Russia," examines the persistence of superstitious practices of falsified sainthoods in local parishes of post-Petrine Russia against the Synod's (i.e., the Ecclesiastical College's) ardent attempts to stop them. To some extent, argues the author, such popular cults were perpetuated by the Synod's ineffective measures and their ignorance of local traditions and circumstances. Susan Karant-Nunn's essay on liturgical rites in German-speaking lands before, during, and after the Reformation makes a similar observation about the survival of some pre-Reformation ritualistic practices (such as baptismal feasts or post-churching ales) among the populace well into the nineteenth century.

Some of the essays do not so much report new findings or sources, as they analyze, synthesize, and re-conceptualize existing material by putting it in the wide political and religious context. These essays draw interesting parallels and analogies with religious processes in other cultures and discern common patterns between them. This moving "beyond the denominationally oriented historiography of an earlier era" (5) comprises the particular value of this collection, as it allows religious historians to "gain perspective from the findings of colleagues working on what seem to be analogous problems in different parts of the globe" (5). Several common patterns come out in this regard, as the editors point out in their introduction (8-9). Among such patterns is the tendency of common believers in various cultures to attach more significance than did their religious authorities, to ritualistic and apotropaic aspects of religious worship, which explains the perseverance of popular superstitions and pagan rites within various Christian communities—a persistent problem that religious reformers from many countries had to deal with.

The authors boldly apply and compare the findings of other historians to their own, and quite often such juxtaposition yields insightful results. As Crummy points out, “recent writing on the development of religious communities elsewhere in Europe provides a stimulating conceptual vehicle on which to revisit the Russian scene” (53). Crummy draws useful parallels between Russian Old Believers and western Puritans, as well as between seventeenth-century Russian ecclesiastic elites and leaders of the sixteenth-century Catholic Counter-Reformation, demonstrating how Russian church leaders borrowed their ideas of reform from the West. Crummy also points to international influences in explaining the division within the Reform camp itself: Russian royalty and church hierarchy styled their view of the Russian Orthodoxy after the World Orthodoxy, in particular after the Greek model (due to the presence of numerous Greek theologians at the Russian royal court and at the highest church circles), while parish priests drew more on local traditions and were therefore able to criticize the inflexibility and intransigence of the church hierarchy in conducting Reform with terrible cruelty. In a similar vein, Frank Sysyn finds similarities between the Ukrainian revolt of 1648 and the Dutch war of independence in that “Both conflicts encouraged the development of a national culture and consciousness that was associated with the new political order” (156). This comparison allows him to notice a significant difference: “In the Ukrainian case, both the political entity and the culture disintegrated in the eighteenth century and were submerged into the Russian Empire and Russian imperial culture, only to reemerge in the modern Ukrainian national awakening” (156). Other international parallels include “new precision in defining the structure of an ‘Orthodox Church’ and its dogmas . . . in response to new confessionalism of the Western Christians” (that is, Protestantism and the redefined Catholicism after the Council of Trent). The West’s new confessionalism, argues Sysyn, “forced the Kyiv metropolitanate and the Ruthenians to formulate more clearly their confessional allegiance” (173) and “to express new views on church, state, and people” (174).

Even if such parallels and connections were not explicitly stated in all of the selected essays, the mere putting together of a variety of views on early modern religious conflicts in such different cultures provides the readers with much food for thought. Overall, *Religion and the Early Modern State: Views From China, Russia, and the West* is an innovative and engaging scholarly collection that

will be of much interest for students of early modern history, anthropology, and religion.

Anthony Milton, ed. *The British Delegation and the Synod of Dort (1618-1619)*. Church of England Record Society, Volume 13. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2005. lix + 411 pp. \$105.00. Review by JONATHAN WRIGHT, HARTLEPOOL, UNITED KINGDOM.

The Synod of Dort laid bare one of the great fault-lines in early-modern Protestantism. The Dutch theologian, Jacobus Arminius (who died nine years before the Synod began) had launched a frontal assault on orthodox Calvinist predestinarianism, by emphasising the role of free will in the salvific economy. New passions and enmities entered perennial debates about the nature of divine grace, the routes towards avoiding eternal perdition, and the extent of Christ's sacrifice on the cross (did he die for all, or just for the Elect?). Into the bargain, this theological confrontation merged with stark political divisions in the Low Countries, with the supporters of Arminius (the so-called Remonstrants) strongest in Holland and their counter-Remonstrant opponents centred on Zeeland and the other provinces. The Synod of Dort—"one of the most remarkable gatherings of Protestant divines ever assembled" (i)—did not witness a sophisticated debate between these two camps. The battle had already been won by the orthodox Calvinists, and Dort was primarily conceived as an opportunity to condemn and silence the Arminians. This was a hugely important moment in Dutch political and religious history, but it also captivated the rest of Protestant Europe and delegations arrived from across the continent. It is also an event that has suffered from reductive accounts in which the divisions and shifting strategies of the various parties have been treated with a distinct lack of nuance.

Anthony Milton's book, a collection of almost 120 key documents, analyses the role of the British delegation during those momentous six months during the winter and spring of 1618 and 1619. He adopts a refreshingly straightforward approach to organising his material. Successive sections focus on the religious and political background of the synod, the early stages during which rules and procedures were fleshed out, the central issue of condemning the Arminian position, the process of drawing up the synod's final canons, and

the events in the immediate aftermath of the synod. A final section briefly looks at the place of the synod in the British Protestant memory.

Milton plans a second volume containing the major Latin documents. Here, most of his sources are in English and encompass official and private correspondence, speeches given at the synod, and the official British judgments on the various theological and ecclesiological issues under discussion. The keystones of his volume, however, are the letters of Dudley Carleton (the English ambassador in the Netherlands), the letters of George Carleton, Bishop of Llandaff (the senior British delegate), and extracts from the papers of Samuel Ward. Many of the Ward documents are essentially notes scribbled down during the cut and thrust of debates, and they convey something of the urgency and dynamism of the synod's proceedings. Another highlight is the inclusion of "The Collegiate Suffrage of the British Divines," the British resolution on the articles under discussion as distinct from the canons agreed upon by the entire synod.

As a compendium of primary materials, Milton's book will be an essential acquisition for all academic libraries, but he offers scholars of seventeenth-century European history far more than a handy assemblage of texts. In a lengthy introduction (and prefatory remarks for each of the sections of documents), Milton demonstrates that older assumptions about the nature of Britain's contribution to Dort ought to be revised. The idea that the British delegation constantly played a conciliatory, peace-making role during proceedings is undermined by the fact that the British, when it suited their interests, took up hard-line positions—they were the first to suggest, for instance, that it would be justifiable to exclude the accused Remonstrants from the synod altogether. Milton's basic point, supported by the documents he presents, is that it is vital to "avoid a simple dualistic model in our view of the role played by the British compared with the rest of the delegates of the synod, and the usually unspoken assumption that the entire British delegation was temperamentally distinct from the rest of the synod" (xlii).

Milton also reminds us just how significant Dort was to the British Protestant identity for decades to come. Historians continue to quarrel about the existence of a Calvinist-consensus within the late Elizabethan and Jacobean church, about the reasons for the Laudian challenge to that consensus, and about the role of all these issues in the genesis of the English Civil War. All of these debates can be enhanced and moved forwards by revisiting the events

and consequences of Dort. The presence of a British delegation at the synod—whether perceived as officially representing the English Church or simply as ambassadors of James I—provoked an extraordinarily lively response from contemporaries. After all, the synod signalled a conspicuous triumph for orthodox Calvinism and, at precisely that moment, battling factions within the Jacobean world were trying to establish whether that variety of Calvinism had a place in the English Church. More broadly, England's relationship with the rest of continental Protestantism was at stake. With the arrival of the Laudian ascendancy during the 1630s, it comes as little surprise that the English presence at Dort was bitterly denounced and its judgements categorised as having no relevance or authority in the English religious settlement.

One's response to Dort, in effect, became something of a shibboleth, and partial, prejudiced analyses of the synod would endure for decades to come. The spectre of Dort loomed large in the seventeenth-century English Protestant consciousness, and any historian hoping to produce a nuanced, sophisticated account of exactly what happened there will be greatly assisted by this exemplary collection of primary sources. This book is a fine example of painstaking, dedicated scholarship and Dr. Milton is to be applauded.

Martin Mulrow and Jan Rohls, eds. *Socinianism and Arminianism. Antitrinitarians, Calvinists and Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century Europe*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2005. ix + 306 pp. \$134.00. Review by MARIAN HILLAR, CENTER FOR PHILOSOPHY AND SOCINIAN STUDIES, TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY.

This book is a collection of eleven essays which were presented at the symposium Socinianism and Cultural Exchange which was organized by the editors on 12-13 July 2003 at the Ludwig Maximilian University. The symposium was sponsored by the Center for Collaborative Research "Pluralization and Authority in the Early Modern Era." Socinianism is the most important and most consequential movement in the sixteenth century that grew out of the critique of Catholic dogmatism, especially of the trinitarian speculations and eventually developed into the Enlightenment and gave foundations for the modern times. The subject of the present volume is a study of the

interactions and relationships between antitrinitarianism and reformed Protestantism: Dutch Remonstrants, some French Huguenots, and English Latitudinarians.

Divided into five parts, the first, Introduction, sets the scene in two essays. Jan Rohls in an essay "Calvinism, Arminianism and Socinianism in the Netherlands until the Synod of Dort" gives a brief outline of the religious scenery in this country from the Congress of Dort in 1572, which established relative religious freedom, to the Synod of Dort in 1618/1619. The dominant church was the Calvinist-inspired Dutch Reformed Church. An important role was played by the University of Leiden, founded by William of Orange in 1574. Rohls traces the history of theological controversies and disputes initiated in 1578 around the issue of predestination connected with the proper relationship between the church and state. Jacobus Arminius, Reformed pastor and later professor at Leiden University, became prominent exponent of opposition to the Calvinist predestination doctrine. The church became split into two camps, Remonstrants and the Contra-Remonstrants after Johannes Wtenbogaert wrote in 1610 a tractate entitled *Remonstrance*. The other controversy that was to persist for a long time, not only in the Netherlands, but in all of Europe, arose around the doctrines introduced by the Socinian visitors from Poland in 1597/98, Christophorus Ostorodt and Andreas Voidovius, who influenced Conrad Vorstius (1569-1622), the first Socinian in the Netherlands. Vorstius was nominated in 1611 to replace Arminius as professor at Leiden. With him began the Socinian discussions in the Republic. Discussions and debates were characteristic events in the Republic and they were centered on the theological doctrines, especially of satisfaction, predestination and on the church-state relationship. To resolve the issues between the Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants States General appointed a committee to convene a National Synod on November 13, 1618 and which ended on May 9, 1619. The Synod was really a tribunal to convict the Remonstrants over five articles of faith. The Synod confirmed the teachings of the Contra-Remonstrants as legitimate in the Republic and established five conservative canons as the foundation of the public church; it allowed, however, a certain degree of interpretation of the canons. Remonstrants not complying were subject to exile. The persecution finally ended in 1625 when Frederik Henrik became the Stadholder. The decrees of the Synod were abolished in 1631 and a

relative tolerance was established, a confessional pluralism, which included Remonstrants, Contra-Remonstrants, Catholics, Mennonites and Socinians.

The second paper by Martin Mulsow “The New Socinians: Intertextuality and Cultural Exchange in Late Socinianism” discusses the further development of the original Socinianism of the sixteenth century into a new Socinianism in the seventeenth century as a “product of cultural exchanges and transfers In other words, the ‘new’ Socinians, as a ‘Transferprodukt,’ are the result of frequent mixing which arose from the migration of Socinian people and ideas to Western Europe, and into a completely different intellectual milieu” (51). This was a long process beginning with the Protestantism in the Italian Cinquecento, then the immigration to Poland, Moravia, and Transylvania, expulsion from Poland and immigration of many Socinians to Brandenburg-Prussia, England, and the Netherlands. Many modern views were crystallized on the basis of the Socinian antitrinitarian and philosophico-religious doctrines. They were formulated on a fundamental intellectual ground: appealing to reason in the interpretation of scripture, worldview, and social and moral doctrines, and appealing to one’s conscience in personal and societal conduct. The next logical step was development of Deism and the Enlightenment. The author traces here ideas and writings of a number of prominent Socinians such as Johann Crellius with his revolutionary ideas about freedom of religion and the effect of his book on the West, Christoph Sand and Samuel Crell in England, Noel Aubert de Versé also in England, translations of the Socinian texts by Charles le Cène, among others. The second part, French Connection, includes one paper by Didier Kahn, “Between Alchemy and Antitrinitarianism: Nicolas Barnaud (1539-1604).” Barnaud was a burger in Geneva of antitrinitarian orientation who is better known for his writings in alchemy. Barnaud translated Socinus into French, wrote several antitrinitarian treatises and corresponded with Socinus and Ostorodt.

Part three entitled “Arminianism and Religious Plurality” contains three papers which discuss in detail the role of Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) in the development of Remonstrantism, how it was affected by Socinianism and in turn how it reacted to other religions exemplified by Islam. The first paper by Florian Mülhegger, “Pluralization and Authority in Grotius Early Works,” deals with early works of Grotius *Meletius* (1611) and *Ordinum Pietas* (1613). In these works Grotius defended Remonstrants against accusations of heresy by the orthodoxy. His line of argumentation was based on the idea that

development of a plurality of views and doctrines in Christianity was nothing new, it existed since the beginning, thus it is something genuinely Christian. Moreover, on the level of authority, he referred to the history of dogmas as produced by various councils, church fathers and confessions again documenting plurality. Next he defended the rationality of Christianity by referring to ancient Hellenistic philosophers as authorities, and in the practical aspect of religion he defended subordination of dogmas to ethical concerns. In all these issues he followed the ideas and practice of the Socinians, thus he was accused of being one of them.

In the second paper entitled “Grotius and Socinianism” Hans W. Blom discusses in detail how Grotius participated in the theological debates through several treatises concerning the Socinian doctrines of justification and satisfaction which were spreading in the Netherlands. What is interesting, however, and characteristic of Grotius is that he starts with a theological issue developing it into an issue of secular theory of justice and punishment. He operated at the interface between a theological and natural-law conception of punishment and integrated theological and legal arguments by describing God as a king in execution of justice. At issue were the reordering and reconciling of reason and revelation and the consideration of human and divine justice under one concept. He developed modern and secular ideas which have, however, antecedents in ancient Hellenistic and, especially, Stoic thought. Grotius’ thought underwent a transformation as well, and in the end he developed in *De iure belli ac pacis*, which was published only in 1868, a very radical doctrine: the justice obtainable among men is the result of the human capacity for self-justification, thus preparing the direct way for the Enlightenment. Further development of Grotius ideas is exemplified by the writings of Lumbertus van Velthuysen (1622-1685) who arrives at similar results but starts from another position, namely from the love of self, the law of self-preservation which is a sufficient cause of benevolence or other-regarding attitudes. He may be considered as precursor of the characteristic Dutch permissiveness, the idea that the evil that does not noticeably damage the state can remain unpunished.

In the third paper, entitled “Hugo Grotius’ Position on Islam as Described in *De veritate religionis christianae, Liber VI*,” Dietrich Klein discusses a topic which has a direct relevance for our own times. Christians had to deal with Islam since the beginning of its expansion, and the Qur’an was translated

into Latin in 1143. He claimed as others before him that God sent Islam as a means of punishment for Christians and argued for the superiority of Christianity over Islam on the basis of Qur'anic analysis, comparison of the theological doctrines, especially that of Christology and its practice. He treated Islam, however, at the same level as Socinianism, though he recognized fundamental differences between them.

The fourth part of the book contains two papers concerning interaction between Socinians and the Netherlands. Socinians were treated by Reformed theologians as libertines, atheists and later from 1640s as Cartesians and from 1690s as Spinozists. In Amsterdam in the 1660s, they published the multivolume *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, the most significant and important compilation of their works. Roberto Bordolli in "The Socinian Objections: Hans Ludwig Wolzogen and Descartes" discusses the opposition of Wolzogen (1600-1661) to Descartes' spiritualism and his defense of materialism against idealism. Wolzogen, in opposition to Descartes, defended the view that all knowledge begins with the senses and sensible reality. Similarly Wolzogen argued that it is impossible to have natural knowledge of God. We can only know God as the *causa remotissima ac prima*, i.e., as a creator of the world. Further, Wolzogen points to the contradictions in the Descartes reasoning about God. Wolzogen could thus be considered as a precursor of the empiricists of the Enlightenment. Rejection of the Cartesian philosophy by Wolzogen represented the separation of philosophy from religion by the Socinians and their subsequent disinterest in the theological questions independent from scripture. The second paper by Luisa Simonutti "Resistance, Obedience and Toleration: Przyrkowski and Limborch" discusses the connection between the Dutch and the Socinians on the example of Samuel Przyrkowski, who studied at Leiden during the years 1616-1619, and Philippus Limborch, who published the compilation of Przyrkowski's works in 1692. Przyrkowski was one of the most prominent proponents of peace among the various sects and mutual toleration. Przyrkowski and later Limborch developed an elaborate theory of the mutual relations between church and state.

The fifth part of the book, entitled English Quarrels contains three papers: Sarah Hutton, "Platonism and the trinity: Anne Conway, Henry More and Christoph Sand"; Douglas Hedley: "Persons of Substance and the Cambridge Connection: Some Roots and Ramifications of the Trinitarian Controversy in Seventeenth-Century England"; Stephen David Snobelen: "Isaac

Newton, Socinianism and ‘the One Supreme God.’” These papers are concerned with the development of the trinitarian discussions in England under the influence of the Socinianism. Especially interesting is the study of Snobelen on the theology of Newton, until now little known, and his connections with the Socinian theological doctrines. The volume represents an extremely valuable contribution to the history of liberal ideas in Europe which eventually led to the development of the Enlightenment. Spreading such information in America is of particular importance since the American Republic is the country founded directly on the ideology of the Enlightenment.

Brent Nelson. *Holy Ambition: Rhetoric, Courtship, and Devotion in the Sermons of John Donne*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2005. xiv + 306 pp + 16 illus. \$38.00 / £29.00. Review by RICHARD TODD, UNIVERSITY OF LEIDEN.

Anyone writing about Donne’s Sermons at this time is obliged to take very full account of Jeanne Shami’s recent magistral discussion (*John Donne and Conformity in Crisis in the Late Jacobean Pulpit*, 2003). Brent Nelson is handsome in his acknowledgement of Shami’s scholarship. A central concern of Shami’s study was to find ways in which to formulate what it is about Donne’s Sermons that renders them simultaneously attractive to present-day readers but yet apparently recalcitrant to appropriate discourse for our present-day response.

Drawing on the recent work of a number of Donne scholars, Nelson, too, is anxious to find an appropriate discourse with which to approach the Sermons. He finds Michael Schoenfeldt’s work on literary courtship particularly amenable to his own thesis, but his argument is most strongly buttressed by a lively and imaginative engagement with the work of Kenneth Burke (1897-1993), a remarkably original but now sadly neglected theorist. Burke outlived his own reputation two or three decades before his death, but is here gratifyingly recuperated by Nelson. Pursuing Burke’s notion of early modern courtship as a suasive device, Nelson quickly and convincingly finds himself in a position to argue that “courtship is tantamount to rhetoric” (9), and it is this identification, based on Burke, that essentially underlies the argument of the rest of his book: elsewhere Nelson writes of “Donne induc[ing] his audience

to court God” (115). Thus Nelson posits that the early modern period’s “broadening sense of courtship provided Donne [with] a flexible discursive and affective structure that would be recognizable and applicable to his congregation’s motives” (12). Nelson concludes his economically structured Introduction by emphasizing the classical nature of Donne’s pulpit oratory, arguing that “*inventio* and exegesis are almost identical” (17).

This is an erudite and civil study, well-written and courteous in engagement with those with whose views Nelson does not agree, or would nuance differently. After three substantial chapters of a more general nature on Donne and courtship, Nelson sharpens his focus still further in providing three case studies on particular sermons. By means of a rapid but authoritative survey representing Donne’s work as a whole, Nelson begins by showing how central the courtship *topos* is to Donne. He develops his argument further by embedding it in a thorough understanding of Donne’s pulpit oratory, so that Donne the preacher, in an arresting phrase, “render[s] godliness desirable” (32). What is more, Nelson’s imaginative recourse to contemporary emblem tradition allows us to see such desire at work within other kinds of overtly hierarchical structures. To this is added a section that traces, from Aristotle into the early modern period, a consistent tradition, regardless of confessional position, it would seem, of what Nelson terms “a cognitive-affective model of appeal” (58, etc.) that will find full articulation in the writings of Kenneth Burke.

This satisfying contextual introduction complete, Nelson prepares for his case studies by ranging through Donne’s Sermons to demonstrate a wide variety of ways in which Donne uses courtship as a topic of *inventio*. Thus the first half of his book proceeds across an entire range of human experience, from life to death. One instance must suffice. Dwelling for a moment on the commemorative sermon on the death of Lady Danvers, Nelson remarks that

the famous and disquieting (and to many puzzling) image of Lady Danvers’ remarkably active corpse crawling with worms below the feet of the congregation is fittingly emblematic of the incessant goad of desire in the flesh that is never satisfied (91)[.]

adding that Donne’s aim here is not simply “to bring consolation in the assurance that Lady Danvers is in a better place, but to goad his audience to desire the same for themselves” (91-2). Having examined the rhetorical figure

of *inventio*, Nelson concludes the first half of his book with a careful discussion of what he sees as a complementary formal figure, that of *dispositio*. The principal element here is to be found in what Nelson terms “courtship as a principle of conceptual arrangement” (137); “Donne’s *dispositio* is [...] frequently designed to bring his congregation low in order to raise them up again with a new vision” (145). This densely-argued chapter shows that in Burkean terms “[e]ach [Donne] sermon [...] is an individualization of Christian forms, or, in Donne’s register, a sacrament” (163).

To show how Donne’s oratorical power allows him to present biblical forms in terms of shared experience between the *rhetor* and his congregation, Nelson concludes with three case studies, of which space permits only brief consideration. Nelson discusses courtship and prodigality in the early Sermon on Isa. 52:3 and courtship and purification in the Sermon “Preached to the Lords upon Easter-day,” 1619, on Ps. 89:48. Concluding with what is perhaps Donne’s most notorious, even controversial sermon, *Deaths Duell*, on Ps 68:20, Nelson shows how Donne throughout his pulpit oratory draws on the totality of human experience, even “visit[ing] death as a courtship *topos*, as a means of evoking conditions of ‘estrangement’ that can be used to move his audience towards identification with God” (198). In a dazzling analysis of *Deaths Duell*, Nelson convincingly rescues this sermon from charges of indecorum, basing that analysis on a firm understanding of Donne’s rhetorical practice, linking it as always to the practice of courtship as fully exfoliated in his preceding pages. Addressing an aspect of this sermon that has troubled some readers, notably Stanley Fish—who has written of its “bald repetition” (240)—Nelson instead posits that “the [...] precise repetition of parallel structures through increasing intensity wins the assent of the reader-auditor by the sheer persuasiveness of form” (244).

It should be clear that this book is a major, necessary contribution to discussion of Donne’s pulpit oratory, and that in it Brent Nelson demonstrates a sharp and scrupulous intelligence. Still, without, on that account, in the least wishing to sour the positive tone of this notice, I do feel bound to draw attention to one or two irritating aspect of the book’s layout, all the more so since the black-and-white emblems and other illustrations are (surely) as clearly produced as could technically be managed, and the text is meticulously proofed. But line spacing frequently varies from passage to passage, producing in the reader (at least, this reader) a faint nauseous premonition of migraine; and on

one half-page (68) an entire section unaccountably appears in a much smaller font. Nor is the contents page consistent with the actual contents of pp. 255-58. Given the thoroughness of the Index and Bibliography, to say nothing of the usefulness of the Glossary of Rhetorical Terms (omitted from the contents page), these technical flaws are a pity indeed.

Matthew Reynolds. *Godly Reformers and their Opponents in Early Modern England: Religion in Norwich c.1560-1643*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005. xvi + 310 pp. + 9 illus. \$85.00. Review by GEOFF BAKER, KEELE UNIVERSITY.

Matthew Reynolds' study of early modern Norwich is an ambitious project that engages with a number of historical controversies. Reynolds maintains that Norwich was neither the insular city described by John Evans, nor the "modern liberal pluralistic society four centuries ahead of its time" outlined in Muriel McClendon's recent work (32). Far from being a haven of religious toleration that underwent a relatively uncontested Reformation, Norwich became Protestant "in a process that was far from quiet" (35). The religious divisions the Reformation created remained rife, providing Laudian reforms with a measure of lay support within the city, which in turn helped to create "a grass roots royalist contingent by 1642" (255).

Reynolds' volume is separated into four sections. The first considers Norwich's response to the Reformation and its emerging identity as a Protestant city from the 1560s to the latter part of James' reign. Religious division was widespread, evident amongst the higher clergy attached to the Cathedral, where relations were defined by a split between those who stood against further reform and evangelical Protestants. In civic politics a group of evangelical Protestant aldermen sought to promote godly learning, through the patronage of charismatic preachers and the attempted removal of those deemed to be obstructing the progress of the Reformation. By the mid 1570s Norwich had come to Elizabeth's attention as moving dangerously towards the puritan camp and her fears were realised as the separatist tradition promoted by Robert Browne gained footholds during the 1580s, as did a separatist element led by William Hunt in the 1590s. While Reynolds acknowledges that in assessing levels of support for separatism "we may not be dealing with the tip of an iceberg, so much as the iceberg itself," he argues

that the significance of the beliefs of Browne and Hunt lay in “the radical continuum it represented, marking an undercurrent of dissent in Norwich, which survived to trouble both the ecclesiastical and civic authorities at the close of the sixteenth century” (97). Some stability was lent to religious and civic affairs in Norwich due to the “measured evangelical programme” of John Jegon, Bishop of Norwich from 1603-1618, though this was quickly unsettled by James’ pursuit of the Spanish match and the disciplinarian leanings of Jegon’s replacement, Samuel Harsnett (111).

The second section charts the turbulent ministry of Harsnett, a “noted anti-Calvinist” as he exerted a tighter control over the city’s preaching ministry, closing a number of lectureships and promoting a more decorous style of church worship (111). By 1624 matters came to a head and a petition against Harsnett’s behaviour was presented to parliament, only for James to intervene and prevent it from going before the Lords. Though the petition was presented at Parliament under the patronage of the Mayor of Norwich, it had not been voted on by the common council in a city assembly, allowing Harsnett to present it as the “underhand work” of a puritan faction (132). Nonetheless, while Harsnett antagonised Norwich’s godly, he also found support among some elements of the city’s inhabitants; such as the group surrounding Robert Debney, one time city burgess and a supporter of a more decorous style of church worship. Through an analysis of the program of beautification in Debney’s parish of St Gregory’s, which came under attack from the godly in the early 1620s as promoting the use of images “to the great offence of the people,” Reynolds shows that in Norwich agitation over church repairs predated Laud’s rise to power by almost a decade (149).

The third section of the book picks up the narrative from Harsnett’s elevation to York in 1629. In 1631 the “trustees for the Religion in Norwich and Norfolk” was established to promote preaching; the specific aim of which, Reynolds argues, was to operate “in the face of official efforts to stem teaching of the central Reformed doctrine, predestination” (160). A dispute broke out between William Bridge, candidate of the Norfolk Trustees, and the anti-Calvinist John Chappell, another city minister. In May 1633 Bridge claimed that Chappell’s teaching of God’s universal grace was an innovation, prompting a godly boycott of Chappell’s sermons. The case was brought before the consistory court and loaded in Chappell’s favour, Bridge being represented as a subversive and later suspended for seven months. Crucially,

Reynolds holds that the spat between Chappell and Bridge contradicts the arguments of Kevin Sharpe, demonstrating that predestination was a central issue in the 1630s. Reynolds also considers the ministry of Matthew Wren, Bishop of Norwich from 1635-1638, whose inflexible enforcement of the “altar policy” during his 1636 visitation caused bitter division amongst Norwich’s citizenry. After the visitation, eleven ministers and one school master were suspended for refusing to comply, failure to reinstate five of whom provoked the then Mayor, Thomas Baker, to support a series of petitions against Wren. Following a number of bitterly divided assembly meetings, a petition was put before a loaded council chamber and it was agreed that it should be presented to the King. The day after this document was sent to London ten aldermen and a sheriff sent an apology to Wren, which “successfully discredited Mayor Baker’s cause before Archbishop Laud and King Charles, much to the chagrin of the godly among Norwich’s citizenry” (198). Reynolds goes on to show that many of the signatories of the latter petition had supported “Laudian” reforms, most evident in their championing of church beatification. Thus, Reynolds highlights the *mixed* response to Wren’s reforms, concluding “that this was so in a borough typically noted for its native reformed tradition warns against making assumptions about the city’s overarching ‘puritanism’” (213).

The final section follows the fate of the Norwich puritan movement into the early 1640s. What seems clear from Reynolds’ work is that puritanism remained as an active force in Norwich, and those who fled abroad kept in close contact with individuals in the city and continued to promote the godly interest, forming “a puritan network with contacts across the North Sea and the Atlantic” (234). From the early 1640s the puritans gained strength in Norwich, and the city eventually gave its support to parliament, only to have to repel a coup by those inhabitants who supported the King two days later. Shortly before the plot, William Gostlyn, then Mayor of Norwich, a pro-Wrenian and future royalist, was arrested on suspicion of being involved in a royalist conspiracy, which opened the way for a successor sympathetic to Parliament. Reynolds speculates that the disappearance of many royalist figures from Norwich may be a result of their joining the royalist army, while he is keen to highlight that “backing for Parliament was far from unanimous” and “opinion in Norwich in the 1640s was as divided amid the collapse into Civil War as it had been in the 1630s” (250).

That Reynolds is able to cast so much new light on the history of Norwich is due to the vast amount of source material used for this study. A whole range of personal, civic and diocesan records have been meticulously examined, which he is keen to note have helped prevent him from adopting “the same uncritical approach to the city archive” that informs other works on the topic (32). Also, Reynolds’ study maintains a balance between recognising the importance of parochial affairs in determining the fate of the city’s puritans, while never presenting Norwich as insular. However, despite the thrust of his work aiming to highlight the fluidity of religious belief, at times Reynolds overstates his arguments. For example, in his discussion of Thomas Whalle, one time Mayor of Norwich, Reynolds builds a clear argument for Whalle not having been an evangelical Protestant during the late sixteenth century. While he outwardly conformed to the Elizabethan settlement, he was no friend to Protestant refugees from the continent and his home parish of St Simon and St John remained stubbornly attached to decorous forms of worship. Furthermore, he was in contact with a number of recusants and his two sons were future recusants. However, to make the case that a “key aspect” of Whalle’s lack of support for Protestant refugees “was his crypto-Catholicism” overplays the material presented (52). Suspicion of Protestant refugees was not limited to Catholics, while association with Catholics never automatically delineated the religious leanings of an individual. That Whalle was not numbered among the godly does not axiomatically infer that he was a crypto-Catholic; religious identities were far more complex than this interpretation permits and many contemporaries maintained cordial relations with individuals on either side of the confessional divide. Nonetheless, this is a compellingly argued and thoroughly researched piece of work, which provides a valuable reappraisal of the political and religious scene in early modern Norwich. In particular, Reynolds’ case study demonstrates that early modern attitudes on religion, at least in Norwich, were rarely defined by consensus and harmony.

Lyn Bennett. *Women Writing of Divinest Things: Rhetoric and the Poetry of Pembroke, Wroth and Lanyer*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2004. xi + 331 pp. \$60.00. Review by FRANCES TEAGUE, UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA.

Lyn Bennett studies the rhetoric used by three early modern women: Mary Sidney Herbert, the Countess of Pembroke; her niece, Lady Mary Sidney Wroth; and Amelia Lanyer Bassano. Each woman has received scholarly and critical attention over the past few decades as the academic world has become aware of the research possibilities offered by women who wrote in Elizabethan and Jacobean England. The trio combines fine language with exciting lives and well-connected acquaintances, making them particularly teachable: students can study the literary works, enjoy the life stories, and wonder at their glittering connections. The problem with that approach, as Bennett points out, is that focusing on their lives can obscure the way one understands their works. Some critics have condescendingly dismissed the work as unequal to that produced by men like Sir Philip Sidney, John Donne, or William Shakespeare; others limit interpretation to the biographical elements, a particular problem with Wroth criticism; or a few misread the works by trying to make the early modern world into one suspiciously similar to the present day. Bennett offers a corrective by examining the major work through rhetorical analysis. Specifically, she begins with an extended chapter on the importance of rhetoric to the literature of the period, asking why no one has done a sustained rhetorical analysis of the poetry of Pembroke, Wroth, and Lanyer. In that opening she reviews the role of rhetoric in the early modern period, sketches the principal points of contention, and argues forcefully for women as participants in the rhetorical world. A concluding section sums up and completes the discussion that begins the book. As Bennett notes there,

... it seems that discussions of rhetorical culture tend to become exclusive through an antithetical aim. In order to be inclusive, one must focus on establishing some identifiable generalities, and such generalities inevitably exclude someone or something. In the case of the rhetorical tradition, that someone is women and that something is often specificities of rhetorical practice. (251)

Bennett hopes to offer an alternative approach in her discussion of these three women and their poetry.

Bennett discusses the writers, offering a preface and four body chapters for each woman, which examine the rhetorical aspects of a specific work and its problems. The brief prefatory section offers the background and personal context for the woman under consideration, but that section is not the important work here, as the book makes clear by using an italic font in the brief essays. Those familiar with the writer might even skip the material. Yet that readerly haste would be a mistake, for the prefatory sections do offer a clear indication of Bennett's own position on certain literary questions: Do Pembroke's translations of the penitential psalms have a substantial political subtext? Where can one find the balance between the public and private voice in Wroth's corona of sonnets? Or how do class issues affect critical assessments of Lanyer's *Salve Deus Rex Judæorum*? The body chapters offer Bennett's own analyses of each work. In the case of the Countess of Pembroke, for example, Bennett's focus on rhetoric offers a useful corrective to the blinkered critics of the past. She shows that critics have simply failed to recognize anaphora or other rhetorical devices and consequently misread Pembroke's work. Despite Bennett's considerable tact, such critics end up looking pretty foolish. In the case of Wroth, Bennett's consideration of how Wroth constructs the corona of sonnets leads to an elegant deconstruction of such binaries as public and private voices or the sacred and the secular. Bennett's focus is instead on the circle that underlies the form, both as trope and symbol. Finally, when Bennett turns to Lanyer, she discusses the way that the work simultaneously praises and persuades. Further she argues for a reading that attends more consciously to rhetorical style. By doing so one becomes aware of the paradoxical mix of plain style with Petrarchan richness as the poem considers the resurrection of Christ. Throughout all of the body chapters Bennett offers useful corollary readings of other canonical poems. She also turns the reader's attention to the way that religious issues and tropes permeate each work.

The book wrestles with issues of gender criticism, identity politics, and false binaries, which are familiar problems to anyone who works on early modern women writers. At times, Bennett seems uncertain whether her reader is someone who already knows about such issues or a novice who must have them explained; similarly she seems unsure of how much she needs to explain about what rhetoric is and what it does. On page 15, for example, she explains parenthetically that rhetors are "users of rhetoric," yet a

few pages later one is in the thick of a discussion of Ramist ideas about “the confusion of dialectic and rhetoric.” Inevitably in reading a study of rhetoric, one must assess the rhetorical skills of the author, and I found myself wishing that Bennett expected either more or less of me. Nevertheless, the work as a whole is a fine piece of work that sheds new light on important literary work, while reminding us that it is foolish to neglect old approaches like rhetorical analysis. It is certainly worthy of its position in the Duquesne University Press distinguished series, *Medieval and Renaissance Literary Studies*.

Hero Chalmers. *Royalist Women Writers 1650-1689*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004. xii + 228 pp. \$110.00. Review by ELIZABETH CLARKE, UNIVERSITY OF WARWICK.

This careful study offers a re-evaluation of the benefits of royalism for early modern female authors, often seen as “paradoxical beneficiaries” (197) of a patriarchal ideology. Hero Chalmers sees no easy linear progression for women’s authorship established in the work of Margaret Cavendish, Katherine Philips, and Aphra Behn. Her book traces the interplay of retirement and political action, modesty and self-assertion, chastity and eroticism, which carries a different charge in each of the three writers. The volume begins in an attempt to understand the self-promotion of Margaret Cavendish in terms of an ethic of heroic femininity. In this discussion, a consideration of class is seen as essential, a welcome modification of statements about gendered authorship in the early modern period. Chalmers argues that female display is actually a necessity for royalist aristocrats, whilst remaining transgressive for lower orders. Her case, while detailed and interesting, would be more convincing if there were more evidence for the positive reception of Cavendish’s published texts: the well-known derogatory responses from contemporaries remain somewhat damning.

The substantial section on Katherine Philips focuses not on female friendship or Philips’ politics alone, but on the politics of female friendship. It offers a study of how female friendship was used by royalists, and even how female friendship could encode royalism. In the process it supplies a great deal of new literary and historical detail that illuminates the theme of female friendship in Philips’ poetry. Chalmers stresses the importance of manuscript circu-

lation to Philips, particularly with prominent royalists such as Francis Finch, Jeremy Taylor, Edward Dering and Henry Lawes. Chalmers identifies a circle of royalist men, the writers of dedicatory verse for Cartwright's 1651 volume, as members of Philips' Society of Friendship. In the context of other works which offer close parallels for Philips' verse it is possible to trace the cultural significance of much of her poetry: its significance in the Neoplatonic scheme which dominated the court of Henrietta Maria, for instance. Chalmers finds evidence of the location in Philips' poetry of an imaginative realm in which Charles II is king, and in which the rituals of the Anglican Church can continue without the existence of its external structures. She also finds similar patterns in Puritan borrowings from Philips, namely Robert Overton, disillusioned Cromwellian general and Fifth Monarchist. Philips, she asserts, "provides Robert Overton with representations of femininity which locate political agency beyond the material sphere" (124).

By contrast Margaret Cavendish's fantasy *Blazing World* offers a fictional realm of monarchical power distinct from political agency. In her plays, however, Chalmers concludes that Cavendish's vision of secluded female community demonstrates retreat as a feasible strategy of collective empowerment: "a voluntary occupation of the centre ground of true authority" (139). *The Female Academy* is discussed in the light of its influences, Jonson's *Epicoene* and her husband's *The Varietie*. In contrast to her sources Cavendish's closet drama shows the devaluation of men as spectators and performers, even compared with the closet drama of her stepdaughters, Elizabeth Brackley and Jane Cavendish. Chalmers pursues a fruitful comparison between *The Convent of Pleasure* and Montagu's *The Shepherds Paradise*, and decides that for Cavendish, the public sphere is reconfigured within private space.

The book really comes into its own in the chapters which deal with Aphra Behn: the contrasts and comparisons that Chalmers makes between her three subjects reveal her sensitivity of critical response and the acuteness of her historical awareness. In the Restoration period, as political agency returns to conventional channels, authorial strategies for a woman continue to be indirect. Chalmers claims that Behn's concerns are both political and "feminist." She depicts Behn's self-construction as erotic and associated with Toryism, but also heroic and a challenge to libertinism as a male Tory stance. She sees the actress as a popular figure who often speaks on behalf of her sex and suggests that Behn to some extent characterises herself in the same way.

Actresses were of course explicitly sexualised, and Chalmers shows that sexual freedom in drama is linked with royalism and with Tory politics, although sexual freedom is not available to both sexes with the same impunity in Behn's plays. Taking on critics and paying attention to source material, she traces an unease with the cavalier heroes' treatment of women, an unease often linked to the female characters' economic dependency on men. Chalmers also analyses Behn's poetry, including a useful section on the gendering of the Pindaric, to show that in her verse Behn disentangles female eroticism from political agency. The book ends with a perceptive reading of Behn's prose. *Oroonoko* is seen as a demonstration of the failure of Western modes to assimilate other cultures, within which Behn is able to voice a veiled criticism of James II's Catholic policies.

The book has the academic carefulness and detail of an ex-thesis, but it is none the worse for that. It offers a careful construction of what "femininity" means for royalists in the Interregnum, and invests the concept with political importance, in contrast to studies which have stressed the importance of masculinity to an overwhelmingly male community of royalist poets. There are some original arguments here as well as some welcome nuance provided for studies of Cavendish and Philips by the detailed historical and textual analysis. This is an important new book that supplies much of the detail for which non-specialists have been looking for some time.

Jason R. Rosenblatt. *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi: John Selden*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006. ix + 314 + 1 halftone illus. \$99.00. Review by WILLIAM E. ENGEL, THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH.

Readers of this journal will be familiar with John Selden most likely because of his discourses on religion and the state posthumously published as *Table Talk* (1689). An eminent jurist and antiquarian who started his career in the house of Sir Robert Cotton, Selden gained notoriety initially for *Titles of Honour* (1614) followed by the *Historie of Titbes* (1618), famously championed by Lancelot Andrewes. His groundbreaking *De Diis Syris* (1617) was heavily annotated by Ben Jonson, and, as Jason Rosenblatt shows in Chapter Two of *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi* (while building on his previous scholarship co-authored with Winfried Schleiner on Selden's letter to the playwright con-

cerning cross-dressing and bi-sexuality among the gods), the author's presentation copy to Jonson documents their close relationship (63).

Although *De Diis Syris* secures Selden's reputation as an "orientalist" (both the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and DNB list this among his credentials), thanks to the recent work of Paul Christianson, Richard Tuck, and J. P. Sommerville among others, it is now more clearly understood that he was a rigorous legal thinker with a clear political agenda. Rosenblatt's book ably demonstrates the extent to which Selden's so-called orientalism can be used to shed new light on his juridical and historically-minded activities.

Situating Selden with respect to the branch of learning known as "Christian Hebraism," Rosenblatt argues that his mature work on the Babylonian Talmud, which until now has yet to be studied thoroughly in its own right, provides a way to link Selden's interests in statecraft to his skills as an antiquarian and legal historian. What stands out most along these lines is his rehabilitation of the terms "synagogue" and "Sanhedrin" to serve as positive and practical models respectively for church institutions and the parliament (267). Rosenblatt constructs a compelling case that, when seen as a whole, "Selden's rabbinic works constitute a notable exception to those products of the English Renaissance that emphasize otherness and difference"; and that, moreover, his *De Jure* (1640), running 847 folio pages, is "one of the most genuinely philosemitic works produced by a Christian Hebraist in early modern Europe" (161).

The road Selden traveled to arrive at such a position—one which can be seen as a journey toward religious toleration that further paved the way for the readmission of Jews into England—began with what can be described as prison writings. He was arrested ostensibly for his role in the Parliament of 1629, though it must be remembered that the previous year he had played a leading role in drawing up the *Petition of Right* so vexing to King Charles because of its attack on royal prerogative. Rosenblatt thus begins his book with the letter Selden wrote to Robert Cotton from prison requesting he be sent the Talmudic volumes from Westminster Library (2), which, in effect, launched a course of study that "would occupy him for the rest of his life" (276).

What attracted him in these commentaries on the laws and customs of the Israelites, and which eventually would figure significantly into his enormously influential *De Jure* (1640), was the Jewish conception of universal

moral imperatives (270). *De Jure* was mentioned “respectfully and sometimes reverentially” (10) by some of the subtlest thinkers of the century who, like Selden, were drawn to the Noachide Law, those precepts derived from Noah’s code upon which later legal precedents were based. The book’s admirers included Grotius, Newton, Henry Burton, John Lightfoot, Henry Stubbe, James Harrington, Edward Stillingfleet, John Tolland, and Samuel Pufendorf, as well as William Laud and Jeremy Taylor. Regarding the latter two, Rosenblatt repeats a commonplace that underscores Selden’s ability to be friends with people of different political and religious beliefs: “the Commons came to him to learn of their rights and the Lords to learn of their privileges” (170).

The influence of Selden’s Hebraic scholarship, especially regarding etymologies and genealogies, was felt profoundly by John Milton. The third chapter, “Selden and Milton on Gods and Angels,” is essential reading for any serious student of the Nativity Ode, *Paradise Lost*, and *Samson Agonistes*. Here we find some startling revelations, for example, about the cherub Zephon, a “reminder of the first time that Satan changed his identity” (74); and about Moloch, the Ammonite god delighting in child sacrifice, whose name comes dangerously close to the Hebrew word for “king” (91). Likewise, the following chapter on “Samson’s Sacrifice,” constitutes one of the finest sustained readings of the minor epic to date. Rosenblatt disentangles Samson’s final act (“of my own accord”) from Reformation commentators’ pious interpretations to argue that, in its Talmudic context, it is Samson, and not Christ, “who is ‘the end of the law,’ and annihilation coincides with fulfillment” (111).

Ensuing chapters pertain to Marvell and Parker, to Grotius, and to Bowyer and Barlow; although, as Rosenblatt confides, many other possible comparisons could have served as well. As a result the conclusion carries with it an implicit challenge for others to take up the baton: a parallel study could be written substituting Cowley for Milton, Jeremy Taylor or Sir Matthew Hale for Sir John Vaughan, Hobbes or Pufendorf for Grotius on natural law, Spinoza for Vico, and the Cambridge Platonist Henry More for Nathanael Culverwel (273). This book, and any follow-up study along the lines indicated, is grounded firmly in the deft scholarly spade-work of Rosenblatt’s first chapter concerning Henry VIII’s solicitation of rabbinic opinion on his “great matter” of the royal divorce, this being the first important introduction of post-biblical Hebraica into English culture.

Among the many strengths of *Renaissance England's Chief Rabbi* is its ongoing attentiveness to the irony, contradiction, and double vision inherent in Christian Hebraism. The complex matter of whether Selden served as a proxy for the rabbis or appropriated rabbinic scholarship for his own parliamentary ends is addressed head-on. Eleven magisterially orchestrated chapters evince the assertion that, indeed, in "the midst of an age of prejudice, John Selden transmitted an uncommonly generous view of Judaism" (9). And so, while Selden, like many of his contemporaries, rejected the biblical Decalogue as being intended only for Jews, "he accepted the rabbinic Noachide laws as binding upon all humankind" (181). In doing so Selden jettisoned the myth of Jewish xenophobia and underscored the humaneness of rabbinic exegesis. Not only has Jason Rosenblatt provided a more complete picture of John Selden and his wide, often divergent, circle of friends, but also he has succeeded in redrawing the boundaries of Christian Hebraism, Protestant exegetical reasoning, and English legal history. Grounded in profound scholarship and a lifetime of Talmudic learning, this book sets a new high-watermark for seventeenth-century literary, religious, and cultural studies.

Paul Cefalu. *Moral Identity in Early Modern English Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2004. x + 225 pp. \$75.00. Review by GARY KUCHAR, UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA.

Paul Cefalu's *Moral Identity* makes the persuasive case that Reformation theologians were more or less incapable of developing a moral theory of practical ethics that would square with Protestant theories of salvation. Examining an impressive range of Conformist and Non-Conformist theologians from the late sixteenth century through to the Restoration, Cefalu demonstrates the conceptual deadlocks Reformation writers run into when they try to theorize a practical moral theory that is consistent with the Protestant order of salvation, specifically the relation between justification and sanctification. More interestingly, he maintains that the theological tensions between moral theory and soteriology are addressed in literary works by Philip Sidney, Edmund Spenser, John Donne, George Herbert, and John Milton. By doing so, he successfully argues that theology does not constitute a static context which literary works allegorize, as an earlier generation of scholars

often did, but rather literary works are critical of Reformation Protestant theory even when they participate in reshaping theology in relation to classical and scholastic traditions of thought.

Following a lucid introduction that situates the book's methodology between intellectual history and new historicism, Cefalu offers a reading of the role of shame in Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*. Complicating the predominate view that the Pauline legacy involves a marked shift from shame culture to guilt culture, from a social ethics to a private morality, Cefalu contends that Sidney enacts a tension within Reformation thought between "an ethics of humiliation, according to which the devout ought to despise shame, ... [and] an ethics of honor and reputation, which inevitably encourages a manifestation of one's spiritual favor to the community" (32). This does not mean, however, that Sidney uncritically embraces Aristotelian virtue according to Cefalu. On the contrary, for Cefalu, Sidney's *Arcadia* exposes not only the limitations of an early English Reformation ethics, which he argues did not emphasize the reflexive role of conscience, but also the impracticability of "a number of alternative classical and theological ethical options, including Aristotelian behaviorism, an ethical system of guilt and conscience, and a purely Christological ethics of grace" (8). Overall the chapter offers a richly layered reading of the multiple ethical systems co-existing in, but not determining, Sidney's *Arcadia*.

Chapter 2 offers a closely related reading of ethics in Book II of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. In this account, Spenser shares Sidney's desire to merge Reformation soteriology with a practical ethical system. More precisely, Spenser seeks to synthesize "sanctifying righteousness," or the outward expression of imputed grace, with "Aristotelian *hexis*," or the realization of virtue through habit. Recognizing the limitations of both Pauline and Aristotelian systems of virtue, Cefalu claims, Spenser supplements these two systems by emphasizing the importance of Mosaic Law. The thesis results in an informed and contextually nuanced reading of Spenser's ethics.

While the readings of Spenser and Sidney are informative, weaving together the various ethical contexts at work in *Arcadia* and *The Faerie Queene*, Cefalu is at his best when dealing with non-literary texts, especially the theological treatises analyzed in Chapter 3. Rather than simply describing the work of Richard Hooker, Lancelot Andrewes, William Perkins, and Richard Sibbes, and then applying this description to literary works, Cefalu subjects these theological projects to intense critical scrutiny. His reading of the relations

between Hooker's soteriology, moral psychology, and natural law ethics is probably the most significant of the four sections in Chapter 3. Developing recent revisionist readings of Hooker, which claim that the English Divine's theology is more consistent with Luther and Calvin than an earlier generation of critics had thought, Cefalu argues that Hooker does not "develop a systematic program of ethical training" (82). Instead, Hooker asserts that "[p]ositive laws, which rely on temporal sanctions for enforcement, displace the need for a full understanding of the content and normative force of natural laws; and sanctifying righteousness occurs following an infusion of the theological virtues [charity, hope, love], rather than through a process of moral effort or practice" (82). The reading is amongst the most sensitive the book has to offer.

In Chapter 4, Cefalu turns to the interrelations between ethics and soteriology in Donne's *Holy Sonnets* and a selection of mature prose works. The most persuasive thesis offered in this chapter is that Donne's sensitivity to bodily suffering upsets the process of working through his salvation with fear and trembling, resulting in a constant threat of spiritual regression. While Cefalu's rigorous interpretation of early modern theology produces alert close readings of Hooker's project, such theological precision risks being overly reductive when applied to Donne's poetry. For instance, rather than arguing that Donne's anxiety about bodily suffering results in a range of possible forms of spiritual and psychological regression, Cefalu insists on making the theologically exact point that such bodily suffering leads him to recoil from the "filial fear" of acting against God's will to the "servile fear" of being punished. While this theologically precise claim certainly helps explain the phenomenology of faith expressed in some sonnets, the implicit assumption that Donne is assured of his election throughout the *Holy Sonnets* overlooks moments such as when Donne asks, "If lecherous goats, if serpents envious / Cannot be damn'd; Alas; why should I bee?" or when he feels the need to query if the tongue of Christ "can adjudge [his soul] unto hell." Although Chapter 4 offers an erudite and engaging reading of Donne, it did not persuade me that the *Holy Sonnets* are dogmatically Calvinist. Such a reading seems to drain the poems of their dramatic power, much of which derives, as Richard Strier and others have argued, from the way they oscillate among Calvinist and Erasmian, Reformation and Roman Catholic, soteriologies.

Just as Chapter 1 complicated earlier readings of the shame/guilt opposition often applied to Pauline cultures, so Chapter 5 complicates perceived ideas about the relationship between *caritas* (or the upward moving love a Christian has for God) and *agape* (the descending, unmerited, love of God for man) in Herbert's poetry. According to Cefalu, Herbert's speakers are incapable of living up to the Reformation disavowal of Augustinian *caritas*. As he puts it, "the speaker seems to realize the presumptuousness of *caritas*, embraces *agape*, but then can only imagine that the result of *agape* is *caritas*, as if his relationship with God is bound in a closed circuit of sacred love" (147). Situating Herbert's poetry within the broader English Reformation project of reconciling justification and sanctification, the chapter offers, among other things, an original and quite persuasive reading of "Love (III)."

The sixth and final chapter makes an intriguing case for reading Milton's ethics in relation to the moral pragmatism more often associated with Pascal. The chapter begins with a rewarding analysis of the ethical vision expressed in Richard Baxter's *Saint's Everlasting Rest* (1650). Though a Puritan, Baxter apparently warned against excessive self-analysis in a way that is similar to related warnings about self-anatomization in late seventeenth-century latitudinarians. In lieu of affective devotion, Baxter exhorted Christians to generate virtue through habit (160). Milton too, Cefalu, argues, presents an ethical vision in *Paradise Lost* that rests on the supposition that habits can inculcate virtue. Cefalu's reading attempts to reconcile the Irenaen school of interpreting *Paradise Lost*, which argues that Adam and Eve develop a sense of moral virtue over time with the Augustinian school which claims that Adam and Eve were created morally perfect. Whether one accepts Cefalu's conclusions or not, the idea that Milton may have valued habit as a way of achieving virtue is plausible and illuminating.

The intellectual rigor and historical erudition that Cefalu brings to early modern theology throughout the book is less evident when he turns to theorizing early modern moral selfhood in the Epilogue. While Cefalu makes the eminently reasonable claim that the psychoanalytic tradition of object-relations helps explain the conceptual limitations of Reformation moral theory, he unnecessarily and unpersuasively predicates this claim on a disavowal of what he refers to, with uncharacteristic amorphousness, as "Freudianism." Ignoring the exemplary work of William Kerrigan and more recent Lacanian-inflected work on psychoanalysis and early modern religious thought by Julia

R. Lupton, Ronald Corthell, Graham Hamill, among many others, Cefalu takes Stephen Greenblatt as representative of psychoanalytic criticism despite the fact that Greenblatt argued against the applicability of psychoanalytic notions of self-hood after the publication of *Renaissance Self-Fashioning*. The result is an inadequate discussion of hazily defined “Freudian” approaches to religious selfhood in the period.

Despite the shortcomings of the Epilogue, the book as a whole is quite remarkable. It displays a profound and illuminating knowledge of English theological traditions, especially for a book that is primarily intended as a work of literary criticism. It offers original and more often than not persuasive readings of major literary works in the period. As a result, I am certain it will come to shape our understanding of the complex relations between Reformation moral theory and soteriology.

Stephen A. McKnight. *The Religious Foundations of Francis Bacon's Thought*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2006. xi + 193 pp + 2 illus. \$37.50. Review by STEVEN MATTHEWS, THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, DULUTH.

The title of Stephen McKnight's most recent book, *The Religious Foundations of Francis Bacon's Thought*, may seem odd to those acquainted with the many books and articles which insist that there are no genuine religious foundations to Bacon's philosophical writings. It is precisely this literature that McKnight has in his sights as he seeks to “offer a corrective to the persistent view of Bacon as a secular modern, who dismisses religion in order to promote the human advance of knowledge” (9). By contrast, McKnight argues “that Bacon's vision of reform or instauration is drawn from the Judeo-Christian scriptures, particularly the Genesis account of the Creation and the Fall; from apocalyptic expectation of renewal in the Old Testament; and from soteriological themes in the New Testament” (3). In addition, “Bacon's Christian ideas are augmented and transmuted by related themes and imagery found in the *prisca theologia*, a highly elastic collection of Neoplatonism, Hermeticism, alchemy, magic, and Jewish esoteric traditions” (3).

McKnight's method is one of "close textual analysis" in which he examines a broad selection of Bacon's works from 1603 to 1626 and identifies recurring, central themes which are decidedly religious in nature and express Bacon's own unique theological perspective. Rather than dealing with specific arguments that Bacon was not a sincere Christian, McKnight allows the words of Bacon to speak for themselves and establish a powerful counter-image of Bacon as one who believed that "science" was an act of worship and a divine calling. Although one may debate individual points that McKnight makes along the way, the reader is confronted with a niagara of textual evidence from a wide range of sources, which demonstrates that those who would separate religion from natural philosophy in Bacon have read very selectively indeed.

McKnight begins at the end of Bacon's life with the *New Atlantis*. McKnight takes exception to the interpretation of Howard White in *Peace Among the Willows* when White assumes that Bacon is attempting to supplant religious hope with a "secular dream of material comfort" (11). Such a cynical approach to the text fails to recognize the great lengths to which Bacon has gone to blend natural philosophy and the Christian religion into a single activity among the Bensalemites. Bacon's utopian community is one in which science and the Christian religion function together as the vehicle for the blessings of God to descend to mankind. The inhabitants of the island, and particularly the wise oligarchs of the scientific society of Solomon's House, foster an attitude of pious humility as the most important key to their accomplishments. This explains their isolation where secular interpretations of the *New Atlantis* cannot. Bensalem's isolation functions in the text as a means to guarantee that scientific knowledge is not turned to the ends of pride and domination (which caused the downfall of Atlantis) but that it remains guided by the Christian virtues of charity and piety. The daily work of Solomon's House is framed by regular prayers and times of worship (26). In support, McKnight provides the reader with a careful analysis of the elaborate Christian and esoteric imagery of the *New Atlantis*, most of which has been ignored or glossed-over by previous interpreters of this text. This chapter represents one of McKnight's important contributions to Bacon scholarship, for in addition to supporting the thesis of the book it provides a careful guide to certain neglected passages of the *New Atlantis* with all of the imagery intact.

Chapter 2 focuses on the *Instauratio Magna*. McKnight again pays special attention in this chapter to what many have ignored—Bacon’s prayers, scriptural references, and the frontispiece of the work which was sanctioned by him to convey a particular message to his audience. The careful analysis of the frontispiece is another of McKnight’s significant contributions to the discussion. However, when McKnight goes on to discuss the parallels in the frontispiece of the *Sylva Sylvarum* we may well ask whether Bacon had anything to do with that engraving, since the version used is from a text which was published after Bacon’s death. Nevertheless, McKnight demonstrates that the Instauratio, or recovery of human mastery over creation, was, for Bacon, a restoration of the power and benefits which humankind possessed in Eden. His own era had been appointed by divine providence as a period when humanity and God would cooperate and human mastery of nature would be restored. McKnight draws some significant parallels in this chapter between Bacon’s understanding of human power over nature and that of Pico della Mirandola (65-9). The intent of this section “is not to claim that Bacon derives his views directly from Pico” but that Bacon, “like many of his contemporaries, drew upon Neoplatonic and Hermetic materials as complements to Christian Theology” (69). If Bacon never came out in his writings and endorsed the traditions of the *prisca theologia* by name, the parallels are unmistakable. Bacon, then, is depicted in historical context—as a product of intellectual trends, both Christian and esoteric, which were found throughout early modern Europe.

In chapter 3 McKnight turns to the *Novum Organum* and traces the Christian and esoteric themes he has identified in the previous chapters. This chapter takes a more superficial treatment of the text than the previous two. The thesis is borne-out, but a more in-depth analysis might be desirable, since many of the support texts for a much more secular image of Bacon are drawn directly out of the *Novum Organum*. Aphorism 65 of Book 1, for example, is often used to “demonstrate” the incompatibility of “science” and “faith” in Bacon’s writings, but McKnight gives it no special attention. It is bundled together with other aphorisms in the single sentence: “Aphorisms 45 through 70 continue to develop the various attributes of the four forms of idolatry” (81). In light of this, it is important to bear in mind what McKnight repeatedly says he is *not* doing in this book: he is not giving a thorough analysis of all of Bacon’s writings. Rather, he is demonstrating the “central role reli-

gion plays in Bacon's thought" through the "pervasiveness of religious motifs, scriptural references, and biblical doctrines" (151). McKnight is providing a corrective to misinterpretations that would write religion *out* of Bacon's philosophy, and he is laying the groundwork for more thorough analysis by others.

Chapter 4 demonstrates that the religious themes identified by McKnight were present already in Bacon's earliest writings on the advancement of natural philosophy. Here again, McKnight has considered writings that are far too often marginalized. When they are brought to the center, they become part of a coherent constellation of religious ideas which were present throughout Bacon's writings and were central to the entire program of the Instauration as Bacon conceived it. In the conclusion, McKnight identifies four themes which define the Instauration for Bacon: (1) The Instauration was twofold, encompassing both a reformation of religion and a reformation of natural philosophy. (2) This twofold reformation was part of an act of God in cooperation with humanity, which, as prophesied, would usher in a special apocalyptic age. (3) Vocation—Bacon understood himself to be personally called to be the instrument by which the restoration of natural philosophy would be effected. (4) Charity and Piety—these virtues are the result of proper religion and the manifestation of what humanity was created to be from the beginning; they were indispensable for the recovery of human mastery over nature.

McKnight is far from alone in contending that Bacon's faith cannot be separated from his philosophy. John Henry, Anthony Grafton, Charles Whitney, and others have maintained that Francis Bacon was a sincere Christian, had a significant millenarian streak, and that his religious beliefs in some way drove forward his philosophy. But for these authors the point has usually been made in passing and it has not carefully pursued. The misreading of Bacon as unconcerned with religion, if not positively anti-Christian, has persisted for too long. McKnight has done a tremendous service to the scholarly community by putting Bacon's religious themes solidly on the table and demonstrating the consistency and centrality of Bacon's belief system throughout his writings. The discussion must continue, but Bacon's Instauration can no longer be considered apart from its religious foundations.

Susan C. Staub. *Nature's Cruel Stepdames: Murderous Women in the Street Literature of Seventeenth Century England*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2005. x + 356 pp. + 13 illus. \$60.00. Review by SARAH SCOTT, MOUNT ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY.

In *Nature's Cruel Stepdames*, Susan C. Staub presents a careful selection and discussion of seventeenth century popular press crime pamphlets to reveal a contemporary fascination with murder by women, especially by mothers and wives. Part of the Duquesne University Press Medieval & Renaissance Literary Studies Series, this collection serves as a valuable resource for students of language, literature, and women's studies. The selection of pamphlets has been thoroughly modernized and annotated, making this book especially useful to readers new to the period. In its format and focus, *Nature's Cruel Stepdames* can be thought to resemble *Half Humankind: Contexts and Texts of the Controversy about Women in England, 1540-1640* by Katherine Usher Henderson and Barbara F. McManus.

Nature's Cruel Stepdames is organized into two parts. Part 1, "The Contexts," provides an introduction to the history of the pamphlet and to women in the popular press during the period, followed by an extensive discussion of several economic, legal, class, and gender issues central to the eleven pamphlets that constitute Part 2, "The Texts." All of the pamphlets reflect "an almost obsessive concern with female violence ... [that] is almost always domestic" (7). The selections offer a range of attitudes toward unruly women, ultimately demonstrating, according to Staub, an ambivalent attitude toward murderous women in the period (42). Staub's findings are compelling ones, and she informs them with the work of scholars including Catherine Belsey, Natalie Zemon Davis, Frances Dolan, and Christina Lerner.

The pamphlets represent the conventional stages of womanhood: maid, wife, widow. To these, Staub includes the role of married mother, given the number and popularity of stories depicting extraordinary crimes committed by married mothers. The texts included in Part 2 are arranged into four sections: wives who murder their husbands; married mothers and widows who murder their children; unmarried women who kill their illegitimate infants; and the miraculous case of Anne Greene.

The first section of pamphlets presents accounts of women violently challenging their *feme covert* status only to be reincorporated “back into patriarchy as victims” (40). Judged guilty of petty treason for murder, these women are shown to be monstrous for the domestic and natural disorder they cause. The pamphlets’ authors, however, do not assign blame to these women alone. In the account of murder by Catholic French midwife Mary Hobry, for instance, Hobry’s husband is cited for brutal verbal and sexual abuse. More overt sympathy toward women is also evidenced by these texts as in the pamphlet presenting the case of Elizabeth Caldwell that emphasizes Caldwell’s conversion to “piety and rectitude” (32).

The second section of texts addresses areas of “conflict between motherly authority and wifely submission” exhibited by married mothers and widows (42). As in the report of Hobry, religious tensions again intersect with issues of agency. In *A pitiless Mother*, Margret Vincent is shown to be a deeply misguided Catholic recusant who murders her children in Medea-like fashion in order to save them from damnation, an act described as “Popish” by the pamphlet’s author (187). Kinder treatment is given to women by the authors reporting the stories of Mary Cook and Mary Goodenough. In the account of Cook, attention is placed not upon the perceived evils of the Roman Catholic Church but upon the failure of husbands to support their wives. In the account of Goodenough, a letter resembling a mother’s advice book takes precedence over Goodenough’s transgression.

The third section of pamphlets depicts unmarried women charged with infanticide, a term including infant murder as well as infant death through various forms of neglect. These pieces reveal “[c]oncerns about primogeniture, paternity, and purity of bloodlines as well as fears about the social drain illegitimacy placed on the parish” (62). Much of the rhetoric resembles the scathing invective directed against women by writers such as Joseph Swetnam. The authors of these pamphlets emphasize relationships of shame, poverty, class, and sex. One such account is that of Jane Hattersley, who murders three of her children—all of whom were conceived by her master who denied paternity. The account of Martha Scambler, found guilty of throwing her baby in a privy, draws attention to the problems of poverty experienced by both women and men.

The final section included in this book provides one of the most unusual accounts found in pamphlets depicting violent women in the period. *News from the Dead. Or a True and Exact Narration of the miraculous deliverance of Anne Greene* by Richard Watkins tells the plight of Anne Greene, an unmarried servant found guilty of murdering her son and condemned to death by hanging. Remarkably, she survives the ordeal, and physicians work to restore her health. Rather than using her case as a means to caution against such behavior, Staub argues, Watkins presents Greene as a saintly woman who becomes “fully remade—and *remaid*—into a more socially acceptable version of womanhood” (97). Her survival is shown by Watkins to demonstrate God’s intervention in an unjust situation. (The child was eventually believed to have been stillborn.) The poems written by Oxford students, included at the end of this piece, offer additional commentary on the strange case.

Nature’s Cruel Stepdames provides an articulate and needed resource for students and scholars of the period as it invites readers to examine many of the contradictions and tensions surrounding unruly women, including anxieties about maternal power, disruptions of class structures, and interrogations into social, economic, and religious positions. For these reasons and for the ways the pamphlets challenge traditional genre divisions as well as boundaries between fiction and history, this book will complement nicely studies of canonical texts typically appearing in early modern literature courses.

Francis J. Bremer and Lynn A. Botelho, eds. *The World of John Winthrop: Essays on England and New England 1588-1649*. Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 2005. 408 pp. \$50.00. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

During the last decade or so, transatlantic context has become an increasingly important subject for scholars specializing in seventeenth-century continental and colonial history. Awareness of this context not only interrogates any notion of a distinctive cultural difference in the colonies but also challenges the impression that colonial developments had little or no impact on the settlers’ European homelands. Each homeland and its colonies did more than share history; they mutually influenced local perceptions and events. The

eight essays included in *The World of John Winthrop* examine the transatlantic interaction between England and New England.

In “England’s ‘Others’ in the Old and New Worlds” (22-74) Alden T. Vaughan and Virginia Mason Vaughan emphasize cultural bias towards aliens. They find that during the early seventeenth century the English expressed their racial prejudices primarily through language. The colonists, in contrast, discriminated by both word and action. Catholics, Jews, Muslims, Baptists, Quakers all made the New England alien list, whereas reformed Irish and Scottish found a better reception in the colonies than they did in England. If the Vaughans offer no news on the subject of transatlantic cultural prejudice, their essay does provide a general overview that broadly introduces the domain of the essays to follow.

Mark A. Peterson’s more enlightening “The Practice of Piety in Puritan New England: Contexts and Consequences” (75-110) investigates patterns defining the politics of piety promoted within various Puritan settlements. In contrast to their spiritual kin in Bermuda, the Chesapeake settlements and Providence Island, the Massachusetts Bay colonists did not replicate the English Puritan sense of identity. Unlike their English peers, the Massachusetts Bay founders did not identify themselves as a people persecuted by external enemies. Paterson discloses, however, that internal antagonists, such as the antinomians and Roger Williams, replaced these absent external opponents.

In “The Piety of Practice and the Practice of Piety” (111-46) Tom Webster observes the general rhetorical use of dichotomy in seventeenth-century English discourse and then highlights its particular significance in Puritan writings. Such binaries as weakness/strength, active/passive, victory/affliction, pride/humility, public/private, worthiness/unworthiness structured Puritans’ sense of reality. The boundaries between these binaries always remained blurred, resulting in a productive Puritan appreciation of “habitual contingency” (130).

Economic tension is the subject of Mark Valeri’s “Puritan in the Marketplace” (147-86)—an insightful examination of how Puritan beliefs resisted, rather than embraced, newer modes of market-exchange based on such depersonalized practices as supply and demand. Massachusetts Bay revised English common law by establishing regulations based on biblical ethics. But increasingly newer economic conduct based on lawyers, agents and credit encroached upon the Puritan vision of a personalized trade that would at once enhance their colonies and export their religious beliefs.

A governor's opposition to reliance on Mosaic law—a battle he would lose near the end of his life—is featured in Francis J. Bremer's "The County of Massachusetts: The Governance of John Winthrop's Suffolk and the Shaping of the Massachusetts Bay Colony" (187-236). In his vision of a well-ordered commonwealth Winthrop rejected the homeland model of governing agents appointed by the Crown. Instead, he revised the familiar pattern of English local government by supporting an alliance between colonial magistrates and Puritan clergy. Bremer presents a fuller account of Winthrop's views in *John Winthrop: America's Forgotten Founding Father* (2003).

In "The Ancient Constitution in the Old World and the New" (237-89) James S. Hart and Richard J. Ross report that, in contrast to England, New England clung to common law. This was especially true during the 1680s and 1690s, when colonial representatives cited common law as a defense against certain types of royal control. Men's cultural control is scrutinized in Richard Godbeer's "Performing Patriarchy: Gendered Roles and Hierarchies in Early Modern England and Seventeenth-Century New England" (290-333). Repeating information available in his *Sexual Revolution in Early America* (2002), Godbeer points out instances of considerable flexibility in gender conception and hierarchy, including the complex example of Queen Elizabeth.

In "Justification by Print Alone?: Protestantism, Literacy, and Communications in the Anglo-American World of John Winthrop" (334-85) David D. Hall and Alexandra Walsham consider explanations for the lack of a New England competitive book trade until the 1670s. The importance of oral sermonizing in the Puritan understanding of conversion does not satisfactorily account for this fact. More important, the authors contend, was the extensive practice of circulating scribal documents, a custom which retarded the need for print and which continued long after the establishment of a colonial print market. Notable, too, were Puritan fears about the provenance and the corruptibility of print. These suspicions, which resulted in the conservation of a more personalized and organic method of publication, seem to correspond to colonial concerns about the displacement of older personalized and organic trade practices that Valeri examines in "Puritans in the Marketplace."

As a result of a long delay in the printing of *The World of John Winthrop*, the value of its contents at this point in time varies considerably. By now some of the authors contributing to this book have explored their essay topics at

greater length elsewhere. Early versions of these essays were read at a 1999 conference at Millersville University. According to two essayists apologetic about the datedness of their entry, expanded versions of these conference papers were prepared for the press during 2001. While the volume's copyright reads 2005, the book was actually published on 30 April 2006.

David A. Weir. *Early New England: A Covenanted Society*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005. xviii + 354 pp. \$34.00. Review by JANET MOORE LINDMAN, ROWAN UNIVERSITY.

David Weir's *Early New England: A Covenanted Society* is a study of New England covenants, both political and religious, from Puritan settlement in 1620 to 1708. Weir has conducted an exhaustive search of all materials relating to the extant civil and ecclesiastical covenantal agreements created in every single New England colony during the seventeenth century. This includes communities founded by New Englanders elsewhere, such as Westchester County, New York, and Newark, New Jersey. The author has plumbed these voluminous sources to pose two questions: "were the early New England civil covenants primarily theocentric, christocentric or secular?" and how do covenants, "both church and civil, relate to the account of Puritan covenant theology articulated most famously by Perry Miller but revised extensively by his successors?" (2). Based on his broad assessment of these documents, Weir concludes that church and civil covenants in New England "reflected a counterpoint of unity and diversity" over the course of the seventeenth century (4). While civil covenants became standardized, religious covenants became progressively more varied. This occurred because of Anglicization and growing religious diversity in New England in the latter half of the seventeenth century.

The book includes an introduction and conclusion, six chapters, two appendices, and a bibliographical essay. A brief first chapter focuses on the European context to set the stage for the development of covenants within New England society by explaining the parish system in England and the emergence of Puritanism in the sixteenth century. Chapters two and three describe colonial charters and civil covenants of early New England. Chapters four and five discuss church covenants; the former covers churches of

the Standing Order, while the latter concentrates on dissenting congregations. The sixth chapter analyzes covenantal confessions in seventeenth-century New England. The two appendices are a listing of all seventeenth-century towns, churches, and Native American praying places in or related to New England from 1620 to 1708 (including a list of citations) and a typology of New England civil covenants arranged chronologically. The bibliographical essay delineates the bibliographies and finding aids available to locate published and unpublished town and church records by colony and denomination.

The author argues that six patterns emerge from his study of New England covenants. The first pattern demonstrates that crafting church covenants was a common practice among New Englanders, while creating civil covenants was not. As a result, settlers initially espoused a variety of visions for the civil order but a more uniform religious dominion. By the end of the seventeenth century, New England became anglicized due to the Restoration in 1660 and the Glorious Revolution in 1688-89. This led to the second pattern in which civil covenants “became more generic, secularized, and English as the century progressed” (226). Despite the growing popularity of contracts to establish legal and political relationships, New England remained deeply hierarchical and covenantal. Fourth, church covenants often underwent renewal, while civil covenants rarely did so. The fifth pattern concerns the separation of church and state in New England in which the religious and political realm maintained their own spheres of influence and responsibility. Lastly, Weir argues that the church and civil covenants provided New Englanders with a sense of themselves as part of “biblical and secular history as God’s gracious dealings with his people through time” (229).

In the short span of secular time, religious life in New England changed significantly after the restoration of the Stuart monarchy. The Puritan consensus was shattered when the crown forced New Englanders to accept religious toleration. The appearance of Quakers, Baptists, and Anglicans ended the religious unity of New England and church covenants changed in response. Creating confessions of faith became a popular way for Standing Order congregations to differentiate themselves from the dissenters in their midst. At the same time, American Protestants came under the influence of English confessional statements, such as the Westminster Confession of Faith, the Savoy Declaration, and the London Baptist Confession. Because of this burgeoning religious diversity, the author concludes, “there was no semblance

of a New England mind by 1700 in the sphere of religious commitment” (231).

While New England became more English over the course of the seventeenth century, it also became more inclusive through the creation of covenantal confessions according to Weir. Based on an appraisal of one church confession, the “Manifesto” of the Brattle Street Congregational Church in Boston, the author asserts that a “new era” emerged in New England with the “explicit expansion of voting membership to females” in the church. New England moved away “from patriarchal foundation cohorts to a pattern of mixed cohorts of men and women”; the Manifesto is evidence of the “silent shift toward the greater and more active participation of women in the affairs of New England churches” (218). Increased activity by women in the Congregational Church, however, occurred in large degree because of the feminization of membership by the end of the seventeenth century. As female members became more prevalent than male members, a congregation’s survival depended on women’s involvement. This has been clearly demonstrated in the literature on the feminization of church membership by scholars such as Gerald Moran, Richard Shiels, Cedric Cowing, Amanda Porterfield, Stephen Grossbart, Barbara Lacey, Harry Stout and Catherine Brekus, and Carolyn Lawes—a literature not cited by the author. Female dominance in church membership does not necessarily translate into increased power or influence.

Weir’s knowledge and elaboration of covenantal theology and history of New England is deep and persuasive and this work provides a comprehensive overview of covenants in early New England. This publication will be a foundational resource for scholars and students interested in the history of covenants, both civil and ecclesiastical. The bibliographical essay in particular will serve as a useful reference guide on all available sources relating to political and religious covenants in New England colonies during the seventeenth century.

Virginia Mason Vaughan. *Performing Blackness on English Stages, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 186 pp. + 10 illus. \$75.00. Review by NANCY M. BUNKER, MACON STATE COLLEGE.

Virginia Mason Vaughan's *Performing Blackness on English Stages, 1500-1800* investigates impersonations of black Africans by early modern English actors. Focus on performance distinguishes Vaughan's study; she argues that the acting out of blackness, repeated over time, contributed to English audiences' construction of racial difference. She describes the theatrical experience as "overlapping and colluding with a host of social and economic pressures, [which] shaped the growth of England's slave economy" (xii). Her convincing readings of canonical and non-canonical plays show theatre's reflection of shifting social and historical contexts.

In "Preliminaries," chapter one, Vaughan asserts that blackness signified otherness, and thought in the Middle Ages assigned moral and religious significance to black as evil and shaped personhood in early modern England. Although white actors playing blackface roles undercut the proverbial expression, it is "impossible to wash an Ethiop (or blackamoor) white" (6), the stereotype existed. The "cues in the text that indicate the actor blackened his face in order to perform a particular role" (5) take Vaughan's focus. Repetitive performance patterns in multiple plays and across centuries, she argues, must be understood as the "projections of imaginations" (5) by white authors for white audiences even as blackface became "increasingly complicated by inchoate conceptions of race" (8). An illuminating discussion of skin coloration techniques such as burning cork into powder reveals the "best black" was derived from manufacturing a powder originating in white ivory; this product mirrors characterization of black stage figures i.e., "blackness is not an originary state but the result of turning white into black" (11).

Chapter two sets out "Patterns of Blackness" that circulated in medieval Europe. Vaughan deals first with medieval mystery cycle plays that ascribed black skin and damnation to Lucifer whose dark face marks a transformation from inclusion of God's whiteness to exclusion from "believers" (21). Including Moors in featuring exotic worlds at Queen Elizabeth's coronation underscored the monarch's role as these figures in urban processions "connoted misrule" (29) and threatened community order. The blackface character "symbolically enacted the colonizing myth that king and merchants could control and transform the darkened aliens beyond England's shores" when removing skin coloring and turning white (33).

“Talking Devils,” chapter three, examines the black characters first portrayed on the 1580s and 1590s public stage and the creation of a new villain type. The actor’s new authority as a speaking character complicates blackness and exhibits a shift from display to performance. Three roles characterize the change. The first Black Moor character with a speaking role, Muly Mahmet in *The Battle of Alcazar* (1587) portrays a complex blackness. He had a mastery of the English language, historical person identity, and a loving wife. Mahmet inverts the stereotype, but his lack of heroism on the battlefield, and cursing his black mother as the source of his troubles diminish his stature. Aaron in *Titus Andronicus* (1594), attempts to protect his child before being a “demonized scapegoat” (50) immobilized into the earth. Eleazar obtains power through a sexual relationship with a royal white woman in *Lust’s Dominion, or The Lasxivious Queen* (1599/1600) and acts upon righteous revenge, but must die to “exorcize anxieties” (56) of biracial offspring. Vaughn closes with a key point: each play’s final scene focuses on a once active and now immobilized black body.

Black “Kings and Queens” were recognized figures on stage, and their performance contributed to the English conviction that their country was “a world divided from the world” (73), according to Vaughan’s chapter four. The portrait of Abed el-Ouahed ben Messaoud be Mohammed Anoun, ambassador to Elizabeth from Morocco after the defeat of the Spanish Armada, links to Moorish royalty stage representation. *The Merchant of Venice’s* Prince of Morocco, Porus in *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria* (1598), and Mulumen in *All Lost by Lust* (1619) wear tawny or black skin that determines their lack of success. Vaughan reads exploration and trade issues in *The Triumph of Truth* (1613) and distancing of London from all the world in Africa’s subjugation visually represented in Abraham Ortelius’s *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (1613). Queen Anne wearing black pigment in the *Masque of Blackness* (1605), although she did not speak, asserted her presence in a “politically symbolic social season” (67).

Chapter five, “Bedtrick,” explores the blackfaced Moor as trickster and more often the substitute bed partner. Created and performed during the early seventeenth century, the plays discussed speak to increased mercantilism and connote English “fears and fantasies of sexual pollution” (75). The author meticulously analyzes seven bedtricks and argues that the “marginalized” black body of the bedtrick exposes “cross-racial sexuality as an exotic ele-

ment that was simultaneously attractive and forbidden;” furthermore, “early modern English attitudes toward female sexuality were entwined with emerging notions of racial difference” (92).

Vaughan extends her *Othello* scholarship in chapter six, “Shakespeare’s Moor of Venice,” by concentrating on the dynamics of blackface impersonation; she foregrounds textual description of Othello’s blackness and the language of “exotic geographical otherness” (95). Her study situates Othello within theatrical conventions of early modern performance but shows him neither a devil nor a natural fool, a servant of the state although a military leader, and enmeshed in sexual suspicions without a bedtrick. The chapter surveys Othello’s blackface performances from the Restoration to twentieth century, culminating with Sir Laurence Olivier’s 1964–65 controversial representation. Critical material from memoirs, anecdotes, reviews, theatre history, and biography weave intertextual portraits even as Vaughan argues that audiences’ fascination with the Moor was the “pleasure of seeing a white actor personate a black man and knowing this is what he or she is seeing” (97). Her discussion of black actors’ Othello performance cautions that restricting actors in this way is a “more subtle racism” than early modern primitivism (104).

“Europeans disguised as Black Moors,” chapter seven, interrogates the practice in late Jacobean and Caroline theatre for characters to blacken their faces when the audience knows they are really white. Vaughan explicates *The White Devil* (1612) and several non-canonical plays including *The Parliament of Love* (1624), *The Lost Lady* (1638), and *The Fatal Contract* (1638–39) performed at indoor playing houses for elite audiences who apparently relished the sexual intrigues that could be complicated by blackface disguise. She suggests their faces insure a “kind of invisibility while participating in complicated sexual intrigues” and may speak to concerns that black servants may be able to permeate racial boundaries in aristocratic households (110).

Chapter eight’s “Avenging Villains” examines three adaptations of earlier tragedies reworked for Restoration audiences: Elkanah Settle’s *Love and Revenge* (1675), Aphra Behn’s *Abdelazer: The Moor’s Revenge* (1676), and Edward Ravenscroft’s *Titus Andronicus* (1678). A growing colonial empire and thriving slave trade meant a black face was no longer a spectacle (131). These playwrights attributed more humanity to the black villain figures, characterized them with “emotions and motivations” (133), “granted more agency” (136)

than in the original plays; the endings were altered to reveal complex persons whose biological compatibility with white women signified racial pollution and threatened the body politic.

Chapter nine examines two of the longest playing and most popular tragedies of the eighteenth century: Thomas Southerne's *Oroonoko* and Edward Young's *The Revenge*. These "Royal Slaves," sons of African kings "cast as grandly heroic, even sublime" aroused audience pity (149). Possibly, these stage performances piqued consciences to unjust slave practices.

Vaughn's chapter ten, "Afterthoughts" speaks to political and racial ramifications of white and black actors playing black roles; her closing remarks advocate flexibility in today's theatrical productions. *Performing Blackness on English Stages 1500-1800* expertly argues drama's crucial role as both a "receptor and a creator of racial attitudes in the early modern period" (17). Exceptional illustrations enrich the engaging and readable chapters. Vaughan's study undeniably provides a wealth of knowledge for theatre historians, literary critics, and scholars of "whiteness studies."

Gary Kuchar. *Divine Subjection: The Rhetoric of Sacramental Devotion in Early Modern England*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2005. xii + 297 pp. \$58.00. Review by KATE NARVESON, LUTHER COLLEGE.

Defining devotion as an act that alters the way a believer interprets affliction, Gary Kuchar argues in *Divine Subjection* that early modern devotion taught readers "how to experience themselves as properly desiring subjects" (2). Devotion, therefore, involves a rhetoric, "a formal means of arousing readers," which Kuchar analyzes in relation to psychoanalytic approaches to the creation of the subject. Devoting chapters to Southwell, Crashaw, Donne, and Traherne, he attends in particular to the way their devotional writing responded to desacramentalizing forces, whether Protestant critiques of Roman Catholic and Laudian "sacramentality" or scientific claims about the body. Kuchar's use of "sacramental devotion" thus refers not to devotion involving the sacraments of the church but to something like devotion predicated on a sense of "the sacred." He draws on the work of C. John Sommerville and Debora Shuger, seeing a "sacramental" devotion as one that conceives a "communicable and hence recognizable continuity among

self, community and cosmos” that was challenged by a shift “from a religion of immanence to a religion of transcendence” (4). In the face of desacramentalization, “the analogically structured sacramental mind sees a crisis in the coherence of the world as a crisis within the integrity of the self” (18); devotion addresses that crisis.

A major strength of the book, then, is that rather than concerning himself with the ways in which devotional literature was Roman Catholic or Protestant in theology, Kuchar sees in both traditions a struggle with “ontotheological” crises, as “devotion registers and seeks to mitigate the increasingly complicated relations . . . between transcendent ideals and historical realities” (8). In devotion, Kuchar argues, “sacramental writers reconstitute within the self” a sense of continuity between created order and spiritual. Kuchar does not interrogate the general consensus that the Protestant mainstream participated in the secularizing shift, even though one of his examples of sacramental devotion is by Joseph Hall, and his study therefore does not test its claims on the vast body of best-selling devotional writing. His subjects, rather, are outside the mainstream: the recusant Robert Southwell; the Laudian turned Roman convert Richard Crashaw; the uncategorizable Protestant convert John Donne; and the mystic Thomas Traherne. Despite this choice, the move to consider as central to devotion issues of religious subjectivity rather than confessional identity is overdue and welcome.

Kuchar’s approach links the rhetoric of devotion to the formation of subjects whose subjection, understood through a Lacanian psychoanalytic lens, is both religious and social. His first two chapters examine the “gendered nature of sacramental rhetoric” in works by Southwell and Crashaw, who both use rhetorical extremes to “predicate a devotionally arousing vision of the continuity between eternal and temporal orders vis-à-vis female ideality” (10) even as they seek to contain the predication’s emotional excesses. Chapters 3 and 4 then examine how Donne and Traherne “register desacralizing transformations of external structures as inwardly felt experiences” and seek to reconstitute a unified desiring subject (19). Kuchar argues that central to all of these cases is a use of hyperbole to express “the profound sense of lack and thus the experience of unquenchable longing one feels before God” (20). If the believer is reconstituted as an infinitely desiring subject, then lack of affect is a sign of spiritual death, and therefore devotion is called on to arouse the affections and to teach “how and what to desire,” a process that involves

“a traumatic and yet vivifying encounter with the desire of God” (24). This account of devotional psychology is not new, but Kuchar offers a theoretically sophisticated approach by discussing devotion in terms both of historically contingent forms and of “processes that psychoanalytic theory claims are inherent to subject formation itself” (29).

In his first chapter, Kuchar argues that Southwell’s texts employ the rhetoric of the plaint that “encode[s] socio-religious conflict as an inwardly experienced drama of submission and resistance,” as the recusant subverts oppression by embracing it in a more powerful submission to divine authority. Kuchar reads the plaint as a gendered representation of an “excessive” passion for Christ that is “simultaneously celebrated and contained,” betraying “long-held anxieties about the devotional power of women” (38-9). Denying that the embrace of suffering was pathological, Kuchar contends that “Southwell made of disempowerment a strangely empowering and socially disruptive stance” (91). The next chapter traces the way that Crashaw pushed the exploration of feminine spiritual desire to new extremes. Kuchar holds that what is most striking about Crashaw is that his “poetry reveals both the limitations and the promise of a ‘feminine engendered faith,’” in which the “Logos has a female face” even while Crashaw remains “within the confines of a Neoplatonic logocentrism.” What is significant about Crashaw’s conversion, then, is that it embraced an “effeminate” sacramental vision that sought to “accommodate feminine modes of spirituality” (148).

The next two chapters focus on the body as the site for the devotional imagination’s most fraught struggles. Kuchar explores how for Donne, the new physiology “desublimated” the Galenic body by displaying its insistent materiality, and thus triggered a crisis in identity. He contends that Donne responded through “the sacramental force of language,” so that “the resurrected body, with its ideal organization of parts, fill[s] the gap . . . left by the partial demystification of the Galenic body” (178), as Donne developed the symbolic force of the Galenic lexicon to envision a spiritually meaningful body. Turning to Thomas Traherne, Kuchar draws on phenomenology, and in particular the work of Merleau-Ponty, to argue that Traherne responds to Baconian empiricism by making the body “not an object unto itself as such, but a medium of experience” (184). Knowledge is not separate from faith since consciousness of the body’s participation in Being is an essential medium of perception of the divine. Traherne employs the rhetorical device of the

catalogue as a form that arouses wonder and desire for Being as expansive and inexhaustible.

In his conclusion, Kuchar offers a reading of Donne's "Batter my Heart" that draws together the aspects of devotional "subjection" explored in earlier chapters. He persuasively argues that whereas most critics have read the poem as revelatory of Donne's own psychological conflict, in fact Donne intentionally represents an onto-theologically specific sort of anxiety, which Kuchar reads in terms both of the theology of repentance and regeneration and of Lacanian theories of subjection, this chapter offering the book's most successful coordination of historical context with current theory.

Divine Subjection is a stimulating book, and any reservations this reviewer has are a function of its method. The study's central claim about historical causation is of the broad sort, appealing to a paradigm shift that characterized a rather elastic historical "moment" (the early modern period seems to include the fourteenth-century mystic Henry Suso) to explain the psychological trauma triggering devotion. All texts, then, whether responding to the oppression of recusants or the new anatomy, become instances of reaction to desacramentalization. All texts, similarly, are treated as psychological records of the author's trauma and process of subjection. Occasionally it can seem as though Kuchar is not offering new insight into devotional psychology so much as translating it into the terminology of Lacanian psychoanalysis. Nonetheless, at its best, the study delivers on its promise to "estrangle" the dynamics of devotion, and it is admirable for its demonstration that political and scientific forces registered directly on religious consciousness and were experienced as pressures that had to be accommodated as the believer articulated a sense of religious identity. Kuchar's demonstration that religious identity involves the fashioning of desire, as much as of belief, is also of great value.

Jan P. Hogendijk and Abdelhamid I. Sabra, eds. *The Enterprise of Science in Islam. New Perspectives*. Boston: MIT Press, 2003. xxii + 386 pp. \$45.00. Review by DARIN HAYTON, HAVERFORD COLLEGE.

Jan Hogendijk and A.I. Sabra have assembled an impressive collection of essays on Islamic science. Contributions range across the Islamic world from Andalusia to northern India. In light of the wide geographic scope, it is

not surprising that a heterogeneous picture of science emerges from these essays. Indeed, one of the key arguments this collection makes is that science varied greatly within the Islamic world. Some of the chapters draw explicit attention to this variation, offering specific examples that reveal the differences. Although the authors in the collection concentrate on medieval Islam, two essays focus on the seventeenth century, and one offers a useful review of modern historiography on the history of mathematics in Andalusia and the Maghrib.

The editors have arranged the essays into pairs around certain shared themes. Rather than follow their organization, I will try to draw attention to two larger themes that tie the essays together: an emphasis on cross-cultural assimilation of knowledge and the importance of the exact sciences. Central to many of the chapters is the question of cross-cultural fertilization. Five essays explore the heritage of Greek science in the Islamic world. Charles Burnett's essay traces the transmission of Ptolemaic astronomy through Arabic culture and into Europe. Two essays reveal the profound transformations in Greek optics that occurred in the Arabic world. Elaheh Kheirandish looks closely at the early transformations of Greek optical terms, especially in the science of vision. She uses the chapter on vision from al-Fârâbî's *Catalogue of the Sciences* to represent the state of the discipline in the tenth century. A.I. Sabra's chapter reveals Ibn al-Haytham's reliance on earlier Greek methods and concepts. Ibn al-Haytham, however, did not simply adopt these methods and doctrines but rather adapted them to fit his own assumptions and goals. In particular, his belief, supported by empirical evidence, that vision was the reception of light rather than its transmission forced him to assign to psychology a new and central role in his theory of vision. Two other chapters focus on Islamic developments on Greek mathematics. Gerhard Endress explores how Islamic philosophers addressed a perceived tension between Ptolemy's astronomy and Aristotle's principle of uniform circular motion. Endress argues that eastern philosopher, e.g., al-Fârâbî and Ibn al-Haytham, tried to find an intermediate position, while Andalusian philosophers tried to reject Ptolemy and construct an Aristotelian astronomy. J. L. Berggren shows how the tenth-century mathematician al-Qûhî looked to the Hellenistic geometers for his inspiration and hoped to continue their project. Finally, two chapters treat the interaction between Indian and Arabic cultures. Paul Kunitzsch's essay sheds new light on the transmission of Hindu-Arabic numerals into the

Islamic world and their subsequent diffusion west. David Pingree's chapter examines how an Indian astronomer appropriated Islamic material and naturalized it for his audience.

A second theme that ties these essays together is a focus on the exact sciences—nine of the twelve essays treat mathematics, astronomy or optics. In addition to the chapters mentioned above, Jacques Sesiano's chapter on magic squares and Yvonne Dold-Samplonius's chapter on calculating surface areas and volume both concentrate on Islamic computational techniques. Ahmed Djebbar's chapter moves away from the content of Islamic science while remaining focused on the history of the exact sciences. It provides a much-needed survey of modern scholarship on the history of mathematic and related disciplines.

The two chapters on the seventeenth century focus on the translation and subsequent use of a specific fifteenth-century astronomical handbook, the *Zīj* of Ulugh Beg, who ruled Samarkand in the early fifteenth century. Pingree traces its revision and translation in seventeenth-century Dehli. He argues that the Sanskrit translation of the *Zīj* presented the planetary data within the framework of Islamic astronomy. The values and names were native to the Islamic tradition but foreign to Hindu astronomy. Unsurprisingly, the translation failed to find a receptive audience amongst the Hindu astronomers at the Moghul court in Dehli. As a result, the translator, Nityānanda, composed an apology to justify his use of Islamic astronomical techniques and recalculated the data in terms that Hindu astronomers could understand. Pingree focuses on the two chapters from this apology that reveal how Nityānanda converted the Islamic astronomical data into Hindu data. Julio Samsó again uses Ulugh Beg's *Zīj* as the point of departure for his essay. His central question is how and when did the more sophisticated and complex astronomy of the eastern Islamic world begin to influence Maghribi astronomers. He finds evidence of the *Zīj*'s use and adaptation in seventeenth-century Tunis. By examining the tables for the motion of the moon, Samsó reveals how seventeenth-century Maghribi astronomy, at least in Tunis, relied on the earlier *Zīj*, that is, the more complex eastern Islamic astronomy.

The chapters in this volume are impressive for their erudition and technical sophistication. They are not, however, for the timid or the uninitiated. Two issues are worth mentioning. First, most of the essays are laden with complex diagrams and mathematical equations that many readers will find

challenging and perhaps daunting. Detailed analyses of planetary data along with derivations of the formulae used to calculate that data certainly deepen our knowledge of these sciences and demonstrate that the authors have a remarkable command of their subjects. Such analyses, unfortunately, also limit the book's appeal. Related to this issue is the preference for the mathematical sciences. Some readers might wish that greater attention had been directed at other aspects of Islamic science, such as alchemy, geography, instruments and medicine. The single essay on medicine, while very good, fails to do justice to this important aspect of Islamic science. Second, the editors have chosen not to standardize the transcriptions of Arabic names. For nearly two decades, historians of science have been urging scholars who study Islamic science to adopt a standard in order to minimize the difficulties facing nonspecialists. The variations in spelling, while seemingly minor, are likely to cause difficulties for readers who are unfamiliar with Arabic or the names of people cited.

Scholars who have some familiarity with Arabic science will certainly benefit from and enjoy this book. Together, the chapters provide a compelling picture of the practice of the mathematical sciences in the Islamic world. They indicate the sophistication and diversity of those sciences. At the same time, the essays reveal that the study of Islamic science is a thriving and vibrant discipline within the history of science.

Robert Appelbaum and John Wood Sweet, eds. *Envisioning an English Empire: Jamestown and the Making of the North Atlantic World*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005. xv + 368 pp. + 20 illus. \$59.95. Review by JANET MOORE LINDMAN, ROWAN UNIVERSITY.

The founding of Jamestown is a dramatic, if oft told, story in early American history. The struggle of British colonists to survive hunger, disease, poor planning, political instability, and Indian hostility are part of a legendary and well-worn narrative. A recent publication, *Envisioning an English Empire*, shines new light on this familiar topic by offering multifarious analyses of the major actors, events, and primary sources surrounding the Virginia colony. This book is the result of a National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institute entitled "Texts of Imagination and Empire: The Founding of

Jamestown in its Atlantic Context,” sponsored by the Folger Library and led by Karen Ordahl Kupperman in 2000. Two members of the seminar, John Wood Sweet and Robert Appelbaum, compiled this anthology to “redraw the ‘map’ of the early Atlantic world” in two ways: to place Jamestown within its Atlantic context and to understand the colony as both “an historical event” and “a literary phenomenon” (2). The volume begins with a brief but concise foreword by Karen Ordahl Kupperman, who provides an excellent context for the volume’s essays. This is followed by an introduction by John Wood Sweet, who explains the book’s rationale in revisiting Jamestown, in particular to explicate the source materials generated by the Virginia experience for both their historical and literary significance. The volume includes essays by fifteen contributors, including eight literary scholars, six historians, and one Renaissance studies expert. It is divided into three parts; the first section, “Reading Encounters,” examines the beginnings of the colony with an internal focus. The second section, “The World Stage,” looks outward to the English empire and its relationships with Spain, Ireland, and North Africa. The third and final section, “American Metamorphosis,” describes how Indians and Europeans interacted with one another and were changed by their colonial experiences. The book ends with a short conclusion by Constance Jordan.

Each section presents fresh insight into the Jamestown story based on analysis of varied sources and different disciplinary perspectives. The first section, “Reading Encounters,” locates new vistas as it treads the familiar ground of English colonization in Virginia. While James Horn outlines the founding of the Jamestown colony, explorations of the Chesapeake by the first English settlers, and volatile interactions with local Indians, Alden Vaughn follows the paths of Powhatans who found their way to England either as honored guests, official envoys, or as sideshow attractions for London audiences. Lisa Blansett analyzes John Smith’s map of Virginia to demonstrate its symbolic power and impact on the development of English colonialism. Emily Rose’s illuminating article on the indentured servant Richard Frethorne reveals the politics of his letter home in the context of a power struggle between leading members of the Virginia Company in London.

The second section, “The World Stage,” places the Jamestown experience within the Atlantic context of the early modern period. Eric Griffin illustrates how the “specter of Spain” (111) pervaded the writings of John

Smith, who simultaneously felt admiration and repulsion toward the Spanish success in the Americas. Despite the value and popularity of the Black Legend among English chroniclers, Smith created a textual self-identity as an English “conquistador” whose leadership was essential to the success of the Virginia colony. Labelling John Smith “the white Othello” (135), Pompa Banerjee expounds on the rhetorical importance of Smith’s Turkish adventures to his later experience in Jamestown and the publication of his *True Travels*. Susan Iwanisziw continues the global focus by describing diplomatic relations between Morocco and England and its impact on English drama during the late seventeenth century. The British-Moroccan alliance appeared in such plays such as *Fair Maid*, which served both as a source of popular entertainment and contemporary news about English activities abroad. Andrew Hadfield concludes this section with an essay investigating the comparable experiences and reciprocal links between the British experience of colonization in Ireland and North America.

Section Three, “American Metamorphosis,” scrutinizes interactions among white, red, and black Virginians during the seventeenth century. This section opens with a comparison of food practices among Native Americans and English colonists by Robert Appelbaum. The Indian ability to tolerate periods of hunger, contrasted to the British goal to maintain “sumptuary regularity” (201) at all costs, conveys a difference in foodways that shaped the conflicted relations between settlers and natives in early Virginia. Jess Edwards provides an excellent overview of the legal and cultural conceptions of land in England and how it influenced, and was itself affected by, English dominion over Powhatan landholdings in colonial Virginia. Michael Guasco considers the varieties of enslavement in English society (villeinage, penal slavery, and gallery slavery) and their impact on new world ideologies and the adoption of African slavery. Lastly, Peter Herman elucidates the literary conceptions of England and America in Aphra Behn’s play, *The Widdow Ranter or, the History of Bacon in Virginia*. Behn’s disappointment in the Stuart monarchy and the political instability of the 1680s led her to construct a version of Virginia which afforded a level of freedom and opportunity no longer possible in England.

Crafting an anthology is a notoriously difficult project, maintaining coherence and rigor can be a challenge when multiple voices and disciplines are involved. While the contributors access many of the same sources, only a few

essays refer to other articles within the volume (the first mention of another contributor's work occurs in chapter five, which is the first essay in Section Two). There is some repetition as the contributors allude to the same primary sources and at times make similar comments (e.g., in reference to Smith's map of Virginia or Richard Frethorne's letter). When differences of interpretation do appear, they are not pursued. For example, both Hadfield and Appelbaum discuss the Picts and their similarity and/or difference to the Powhatans but make no reference to the other's article. This lack of intertextual analysis is surprising in a publication dominated by literary scholars. These concerns, however, do not detract from the solid research presented in this volume. *Envisioning an English Empire* includes first-rate scholarship and contributes to the ever-growing pile of publications in the field of Atlantic studies by highlighting the myriad connections between Europe, Africa, and the Americas in the colonial enterprises of the early modern period.

Phil Withington. *The Politics of Commonwealth: Citizens and Freemen in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. xiv + 298 pp. \$75.00. Review by SIMON KOW, UNIVERSITY OF KING'S COLLEGE.

In chapter 29 of *Leviathan*, Hobbes characterized "Corporations" as "many lesser Common-wealths in the bowels of a greater, like wormes in the entrayles of a natural man." Phil Withington expands upon the implicit assumption in Hobbes's scathing remark of the importance of urban political culture in sixteenth and seventeenth century England. This book seeks to redress the neglect of urban political culture in historical scholarship on early modern England. It is conventionally assumed that the eighteenth century witnessed a flowering of civil society in England relative to the relation between state and subject in previous centuries. Withington argues for the "sustained urbanisation" in the latter period by charting "the propagation, institutionalisation, and practice of 'civility' and 'good government' within English cities and towns between the Reformation and Glorious Revolution" (7). *The Politics of Commonwealth* is a detailed, well-written study that will appeal mainly to social and cultural historians of early modern England.

Part 1 introduces the context of urbanisation in early modern England. Withington describes the role of commercialisation in the formation of the English corporate system. Urban historians, he notes, have tended to focus only on “the imperatives of regulation and peace” in the corporate towns, whereas he addresses the oft-neglected “symbiotic relationship between civic and economic development” (28). Accordingly, Withington carefully examines apprenticeships, civil litigations, borough courts, and town hall building to identify this correlation and urban growth. In this and other chapters, he draws upon literary sources (particularly Andrew Marvell) to illustrate these points: thus *The Merry Wives of Windsor* is adduced as a “city comedy” in which Windsor is “precisely the kind of civic community around which city commonwealths were built” (47). The incorporated cities and towns, he concludes, were paradoxical: both sites of commerce and of separateness between its members; epitomes of the modernity of urbanisation but also imbued with “essentially retrospective” humanist ideologies (48).

The first chapter in Part 2 discusses the “cultural resource” of ideology in the city commonwealth. Withington brings out the richness of ideological debates among early modern citizens and freemen. More and Bacon represented two opposing tendencies in civic humanism—the commonwealth of virtue as opposed to the kingdom of subjects—but both advocated a meritorious aristocracy. Their visions in turn influenced town clerks, citizens, burgesses, lawyers, and poets as well as King James. The prevalence of civic ideology was demonstrated in the ways in which parliamentarian and royalist propagandists addressed the citizenry. Thus “local commonwealths ... effectively linked the classical humanism of the mid-sixteenth century to the re-emergence of mixed constitutional rhetoric in the 1640s” (78).

The next two chapters focus on the relationship of place and person in the city commonwealth, and on the “politics of company” in civic conversations. Liberty, freedom, and citizenship tended to be tied to place more than to the innate person; and Withington shows the differences of place between and within various city commonwealths. “There was,” he concludes, “an early modern *concept* of place that positioned the person in a variety of structures—institutional, geographical, and architectural—and which was used within a number of political traditions” (122). Despite his detailed account, however, this concept of place remains a vague one by the end of the chapter. This is true also of the “politics of company,” meant to describe sociability in

the urban context but often seeming to amount to nothing more than gossip and brawling. Withington maintains that such civic conversations demonstrate the presence of community discourse among early modern English citizens, in contrast to the Habermasian thesis that “the ideal of rational discourse only emerged with the ‘transformation of the bourgeois public sphere’ during the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries” (150).

The first two chapters in Part 3 address questions of economy and patriarchy. Withington takes a “civic perspective on economic culture” (161) by examining the urban freedom of artisans, tradesmen, and mercantile elites in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. These groups constituted a “dynamic civic culture” (170) based on the classical concept of *honestas*, i.e., honesty and civility. The civility associated with the eighteenth century middle classes “bears more than a passing resemblance to the values of urban freedom practised during the previous 150 years” (194). Such values were also applicable to the place of women. In contrast to the view that women only occupied the private sphere, Withington suggests that despite the general patriarchy in early modern English society, the household was itself a political entity in which women were empowered: “the words of women were not distinct from civil society; they were civil society” (199).

Finally, the author turns to the “resonance between Calvinism and citizenship” detected by Hobbes and others: not a “deterministic link between citizenship and militant Protestantism,” but “a process of cultural symbiosis by which ‘puritanism’ became the dominant idiom through which the ideology of city commonwealth was expressed and enacted” (233). Thus puritanism was employed to justify the place of the citizenry as opposed to the established clergy, aristocracy, and monarchy. Withington (somewhat unclearly) identifies a *republicanism* of citizens, distinct from the republicanism of Milton and others; the former was more hesitant about revolution than the latter. In general, however, the civic virtues associated with honesty were foils to the values of “the episcopal party” (260).

Withington claims that *The Politics of Commonwealth* “offers a counterpoint to the narrative of sovereign state and private subjects found in writers like Jonson, Bacon, Hobbes, Baines, Brady, and Barbon” (267), but its chief merit lies in its wealth of historical detail rather than in providing a defence of early modern civic culture as a coherent political and social ideal. Indeed, the abundance of sources serves rather to impress upon the reader the amor-

phous character of the political culture of citizenship in early modern England. Withington's book is a useful reinterpretation of early modern English society for scholars of social and cultural history, but a work of limited interest to historians of ideas.

Michael Losonsky. *Enlightenment and Action from Descartes to Kant: Passionate Thought*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. xvii + 221 pp. \$80.00. Review by JOSEPH M. MCCARTHY, SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY.

Immanuel Kant's famed 1784 essay "What is Enlightenment" presented a notion of human enlightenment as a liberation of the self from a state of immature irresolution by means of the voluntary and public operation of reason. The sources of this view of are rich and complex but, as Losonsky points out, surely include the philosophical thought of seventeenth-century Europe that contains, at least in embryo, the major notions that inform Kant's view. His aim, therefore, "is to show that there is an evolution from Descartes to Leibniz that takes us to the threshold of Kant's conception of human enlightenment as something that requires the public exercise of reason" (ix). To do this, Losonsky focuses on the topic of irresolution in seventeenth-century philosophy. Irresolution, the failure to decide what is true and what it not, renders individuals unable to exercise their reason autonomously and imprisons them in a self-imposed immaturity. Two major approaches to curing irresolution were advanced in seventeenth-century thought. To those who believed in "inspired" thinking, as did such enthusiasts as John Webster and Jakob Boehme (and, despite appearances to the contrary, Henry More), as well as to those who, like Baruch de Spinoza, espoused "resolute" thinking, the key to overcoming irresolution could only be divine inspiration, since for them the mind is primarily an involuntary automaton inclined by nature to reflect the external world truly and accurately. But to those who, like René Descartes, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, conceived the mind as the creature of human activity, the answer to irresolution is the exercise of the will in making informed judgments and adhering to them.

Descartes, of course, is iconic for putting an end to real or feigned systematic doubt at the point of his famous *cogito*, popularly rendered from the stuff of his Second Meditation: “*I am, I exist* is necessarily true whenever it is mentally conceived or put forward by me.” Losonsky suggests that Descartes could as easily and properly have written, “I will, therefore I am,” so that not only thinking but willing oneself to pursue a rigorous chain of thought not only conquers doubt but rescues us from solipsism by leading us to realize that we are imbedded in a material environment that is in part social. Here is an irreplaceable starting point on the road to Kant’s notion of the public exercise of reason. If Descartes is the exemplar of willful thinking, Hobbes ought to be seen as the advocate of “passionate thinking,” providing another contribution to Kant’s eventual formulation of enlightenment by explaining how internal states and outer behavior inevitably conspire to constitute a cognitive process that cannot be complete without expression in a natural and social environment. Locke contributes the notion of mental operations producing such “passions” as satisfaction or uneasiness which motivate us to regulate our thinking, leading us to the act of “making ideas,” mental labor that clearly consists in overwhelming doubt by a willful mental activity.

At this point, Losonsky examines the other side of the coin, the arguments advanced by advocates of enthusiasm to assert that knowledge cannot be produced by the activity of the will but must be the function of divine illumination. He begins with John Webster’s critique of the training of clergy and the university curriculum, moves on to Jakob Boehme’s quest for the divinely created language of nature that precedes and underlies all other tongues, and then analyzes the affinity of Henry More, the Cambridge Platonist, with the very enthusiastic ideas against which he argued eloquently. Losonsky then devotes a chapter to Spinoza’s “resolute thinking,” in which he specifies the verbal and intellectual similarities of this “God-intoxicated man” to sectarian enthusiasts. Indeed, in placing his faith in the notion of mental activity as a complexus of divinely inspired inner convictions, Spinoza seems to be giving it the status of divine grace, the unmerited gift of God, not to be attained by purely human striving or any volitional activity, if it is not conferred.

Returning to the voluntarist tradition, Losonsky takes up Leibniz’s “trained thinking.” Though he rejects Descartes’ view that judgments are a product of will and speaks of the mind as a spiritual automaton, Leibniz makes room for the concept of improving the operation of the automaton by the disci-

plined methodology of intellectual work using language (“physical symbols”) that requires a body and hence involves physical activity demanding association for its perfection, i.e. contributing to the general good by enlightening peoples’ understanding, encouraging people to act according to reason and removing obstacles to the search for truth. So the improvement of cognition flows into public activity that requires a social and political order supportive of or receptive to enlightenment. Looking back on the proponents of willful thinking, Losonsky concludes: “These, then, are the threads—reforming the human understanding, liberating it from external authority, making it more self-reliant, using the mind’s automatic processes, and guiding it through voluntary physical behavior—that Leibniz weaves together in his philosophy, and this is the cloth that Kant uses to fashion his Enlightenment essay in 1784” (187).

This is a rich feast, to be chewed over slowly since it is suggestive rather than conclusive and very demanding in its close reading of these thinkers. Those familiar with the territory will find its intent clear but will have to assess the adequacy of the linkage of the central notions repeatedly addressed, for such terms cannot in their nature be undistributed and, in particular cases such as “willful” drag with them connotations that are difficult to manage. The almost complete lack of any attempt to locate these ideas in any larger historical and cultural context than the writings of the individual discussed leaves a rich agenda to be pursued in clarifying the emerging conception of the Enlightenment in the seventeenth century.

Catherine Gimelli Martin, ed. *Milton and Gender*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xiii + 277 pp. + 12 illus. \$75.00. Review by JULIA M. WALKER, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT GENESEO.

As Catherine Gimelli Martin introduces her outstanding collection, she positions the essays in relation to the “wave” theory of twentieth-century feminism. In this she does *Milton and Gender* much less than justice. Although Martin herself suggests, in both her introduction and at length in her essay, that we should put less emphasis on so-called first-wave, second-wave, and other-wave feminisms in general and the views of Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar in their 1977 *The Madwoman in the Attic* in particular, by using these

critical frames of reference so relentlessly, Martin comes close to presenting her own arguments and those of her contributors as ineluctably trapped in what she correctly sees as a reductive feminist dialectic. Furthermore, her warnings seem unnecessary, as all of the scholar/critics in Martin's collection frame their arguments in the larger context of seventeenth-century (and later) intellectual history rather than in some ideological fem-orama. What we find here is the lens of gender used to read not only the expected topics of masculinism, misogyny, patriarchy, sex, marriage, and divorce, but also issues of nationalism, theology, ontology, and modernity.

Martin divides the essays into three groups. In Part I: Masculinity, Divorce, and Misogyny in Milton's Prose, Gina Haushnecht reads the divorce tracts to explore "The gender of civic virtue"; James Grantham Turner writes of "The aesthetics of divorce; 'masculinism,' idolatry, and poetic authority in *Tetrachordon* and *Paradise Lost*," while Martin turns her attention to *Samson Agonistes* and "Milton's Christian liberty of divorce," declaring Dalila "the most powerfully intelligent and ethically self-determining female character of [Milton's] era" (70)—quite a statement in this or any other context.

The second section of the collection is devoted to The Gendered Subjects of Milton's Major Poems. Here *Samson* edges out *Paradise Lost* as the most-examined text. Two authors examine the closet drama in relation to physical motherhood—Amy Boesky in "Samson and surrogacy" and Rachel Trubowitz in "'I was his nursling once': nation, lactation, and the Hebraic in *Samson Agonistes*." Achsah Guibbory also links gender, religion, and nationalism in the collection's most outstanding essay: "'The Jewish Question' and 'The Woman Question' in *Samson Agonistes*: gender, religion, and nation." Guibbory argues that, by his use of the Hebrew Bible, Milton tips his hand on the post-Restoration issue of nationhood as he "transforms the narrative from Judges in ways that devalue both the Israelites and women" (184). Milton's Samson "distances himself from women, the feminine, and his Hebrew origins," writes Guibbory, just as Milton felt the need to distance himself from the "national ideal that had engaged [him] during the revolutionary period," since that "Israelite mythos" (184) had become the intellectual property of the royalists and celebrated in the Restoration. While the OED may list "Israelites," "Hebrews," and "Jews" as seventeenth-century synonyms, Guibbory notes that Milton's distinctions among these terms are crucial to an understanding of his closet drama. Ultimately, Milton defines "Christian

liberty ... against the supposed Jewish affinity for bondage” (187). And women, states Guibbory flatly, “seem to have had no positive role in Milton’s imagining of England’s liberty” (189). In the course of his text, Milton transforms “the Jewish idea of the Nazarite as ‘separate to God’ ... to mean separate from the Jews and from women” (194). In his death Samson is both liberated and re-masculinized as well as separated entirely from the feminine, now a worthy hero for “those few Englishmen who, retaining the seeds of Christian liberty, still might bring down the idolatrous temple” (200).

Marshall Grossman’s tightly stitched argument, “The genders of God,” parses three scenes of creation: Eve’s, Sin’s, and the Son’s. “God creates Eve out of the substance of Adam’s body—Adam’s rib is, then, the material kernel or pre-existing matter that combines with Adam’s idea of a mate to form Eve as an independent creation” (105). Sin, on the other hand, is “a generation from Satan’s thought exemplifying the *creatio ex nihilo* Milton otherwise seems at such odd pains to reject,” making Sin “the thought of negation joined to the absence of material ... the phenomenal appearance of nothing—the reified form of the negative” (109). Grossman then juxtaposes both Sin’s “generation” and Eve’s “creation” with “a third scene of pre- rather than pro-creative activity: The Father’s off-stage ‘begetting’ of his only Son” (109). Thus, Grossman concludes, “The movement of self-alienation and recuperation ascribed to God’s *creatio pro se* beyond the text [confers] on the text a (feminine) subjectivity distinct from Milton’s in the same way that a creature’s subjectivity is distinct from God’s” (110).

In the same section, John Rogers, in “The fruit of marriage in *Paradise Lost*,” stresses the problematic relationship between the fall and marriage, beginning by positing that in *De Doctrina* Milton struggles “not only to make the best theological sense he can of that ultimately inexplicable event, the fall, but to implot that scriptural event within a plausible literary narrative” (116) that must somehow include both forbidden fruit and the fruit of a union. In “The experience of defeat: Milton and some female contemporaries,” Elizabeth M. Sauer breaks new ground as she ties the integrally Protestant “practice of recording the experiences of defeat and persecution” (135) to the “experience of defeat” separately articulated by Milton and by “female visionaries who in the 1650s and ‘60s contributed to a literature of suffering” (133). Not an influence study, Sauer’s excellent essay sets forth the work of Mary Cary, Anna Trapnel, Margaret Fell, and Anne Wentworth as generating a “literature

of suffering” (134) through shared experiences and a “common identification with the Hebraic tradition” (148). The more their writing can be seen to parallel the concerns of Milton’s poetry, the more an acknowledgment of these women “unsettles conventional responses to Milton as a prophet-poet and demands a reconception of epic prophecy” (148).

The first essay in part two is a surprisingly canonical reading by William Shullenberger: “The profession of virginity in *A Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle*.” After rehearsing the views of critics from Angus Fletcher to Camille Paglia, Schullenberger offers a brief discussion of desire and virginity in both the *Maske* and Shakespeare’s *The Tempest*, suggesting that “Milton constructs the dramatic experiment of his *Maske* out of the question of what might have happened to Miranda if her father were not around to protect and supervise her passage from childhood to womanhood” (81). Leaving the problems this raises unresolved, Schullenberger moves into an extended comparison of the Medusa narrative in the *Maske* and George Sandys’ *Ovid’s Metamorphoses English’d, Mythologiz’d, and Represented in Figures*. What’s missing here is any suggestion as to why Milton would have privileged Sandys’, rather than Ovid’s own text, as a baseline for reading the Elder Brother’s references to Medusa.

Martin expands the focus of her collection from the seventeenth century to the nineteenth and twentieth in Part III: Gendered Subjectivity in Milton’s Literary History. In “George Eliot as a ‘Miltonist’: marriage and Milton in *Middlemarch*,” Dayton Haskin explores Eliot’s “interest in Milton as an authority on love and marriage,” making the case that from “early on in her writing career . . . Mary Ann Evans had become a ‘Miltonist’ in the precise sense of the term that dates to the Commonwealth”—one who follows Milton’s views on divorce (209). Using as a foundation the two reviews written by Mary Ann Evans on Thomas Keightley’s *An Account of the Life, Opinions, and Writings of John Milton*, Haskin moves into a nuanced reading of the characters in *Middlemarch*. Making the case that it is “not the ineffective Casaubon whom George Eliot has made truly reminiscent of Milton,” (215) Haskin allows that “Eliot gives Lydgate something of Milton’s reforming zeal, but she represents him as far more timid than Milton in applying it in . . . the lowly domestic sphere” (216-17). Rather, Haskin argues, it is “Dorothea [who] is represented in terms reminiscent of Milton as George Eliot found him in the prose tracts

he wrote in the cause of ecclesiastical, domestic, and civil liberty,” Dorothea who “emerges as the heroine of Eliot’s ‘home epic’” (217).

The final two essays in the collection are “Saying it with flowers: Jane Giraud’s ecofeminist *Paradise Lost* (1846)” (Giraud was the first woman to illustrate Milton’s works) by Wendy Furman-Adams and Virginia James Tufte and—very appropriately—Lisa Low’s examination of “Woolf’s Allusion to *Comus* in *The Voyage Out*.”

The collection as a whole is both solid and diverse, with many essays contributing new information and insights on Milton’s works and four stand-out essays that may become classics—those by Guibbory, Grossman, Sauer, and Haskin. Gender is the touchstone here, not the organizing principle, and the collection is all the stronger for this. *Milton and Gender* is a book no library should be without.

Michael Lieb. *Theological Milton: Deity, Discourse, and Heresy in the Miltonic Canon*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2006. xi + 348 pp. \$60.00. Review by LARRY ISITT, COLLEGE OF THE OZARKS.

Theological Milton is an intricately argued defense against the charge of heterodoxy in John Milton’s theological treatise, *De Doctrina Christiana*, and in his poetry, especially *Paradise Lost*. Professor Lieb’s guiding thesis in this three part essay is that God is hidden (“*deus absconditus*”) and past knowing in any ultimate sense (his “ontology”). The parameters of *Theological Milton* begin and end in uncertainties about a God who “is beyond our knowing in any form, discursive or otherwise” (114). Lieb’s manner of argument is ever cautious, ever in the uncertain mode he says is Milton’s way: “This very uncertainty and contention governs my own ‘take’ on the God of Milton’s oeuvre” (16).

Part One, “The Discourse of Theology,” introduces the theme of the hiddenness of God in the *De Doctrina*. “Milton’s God is buried in the proof-texts” just as Milton himself “is buried in the text of his treatise” (69). The treatise, Lieb insists, is “*sui generis*” despite its obvious affinities with theological treatises by William Ames and John Wolleb, and with the logically rigorous methodological format of Peter Ramus. The thousands of proof texts Milton draws from Scripture are only accommodative, and insufficient to

reach God's ultimate ontology. Milton is hidden because the manuscript we possess is a "palimpsest" with "many layers of writing" (17) and the product of unreliable amanuenses. Thus we have no "ur-text," as it were, one representing Milton's actual thoughts (20). By this reading Lieb has thrown Milton's voice into doubtful shades significantly undercutting his affirmation that he is "a firm believer in Miltonic authorship" (4). And yet throughout, he always makes assertions that depend on Milton actually being the author of the treatise. Lieb would have it both ways, it seems, and one suspects that this is a deliberate tactic in defense of Milton's theology.

Part Two, "The Poetics of Deity," is a complex, brilliant survey of the passibility-impassibility debates in church history from the ancients through the Reformation which points to Milton's God as being entirely passible, a position consonant with such fathers as Tertullian and Origen. We must take God as Milton presents him in *Paradise Lost* and *Samson Agonistes* even though the at times fierce language characterizing him is troubling. The attributes of fear, terror, wrath, dread, and even hatred are really reflective of Milton's conception so far as God may be known at all and are "the means by which his presence is made known in accommodated form" (156). Lieb's appropriate label for such language is *theopathia*, "a new form of passibility" (146). Such language, however, does not cancel the higher concept of *deus absconditus* found, for example, in Book Three of the epic where the angels sing of the Father as "Omnipotent, Immutable, Immortal, Infinite, [and] Eternal" (156). Lieb neatly solves the objection of those who may wish to equate God's hatred with hatred characteristic of Satan and his angels. Though he is a God of hate ("*odium Dei*"), he is no merciless tyrant but instead uses hatred, wrath, and punishment with the end in view of restoration. Though God is *odium Dei*, he is nevertheless also the *amor Dei*, whose love restores those he has punished. *Paradise Lost* "is an epic in which the theme of divine love must be viewed within the context of its apparent opposite divine hate" (183).

Part Three, "The Heresies of Godhead," is occupied with Socinianism, the specifically seventeenth-century heresy and with Arianism, the first great heresy of the Christian Church. Socinians believed Jesus to be merely a man, while Arians held that the Son of God was not co-equal or co-eternal with the Father in the Godhead. Milton is neither one because his critics use questionable evidence and methodologies to convict him of the charges. Though the *De Doctrina* does have some affinity with beliefs held in Socinianism, there

are “important aspects of the treatise [that] do suggest a decidedly anti-Socinian point of view” (245). Arianism is likewise an uncertain case to make against Milton because, for one thing, the terms involved, all of them—*Arius*, *Arianism*, *Arian*, *ousia*, *homoousia*, *substantia*—are inaccurate, ineffective, and continuously debated by historians. Arianism is but a “construction,” a “fantasy” devised by “polemicists to counter the threat of heterodoxies that were notoriously on the rise in the early church” (265). For another, we cannot be sure of what Arius actually thought since most of what we know of him comes from his enemies, especially Athanasius, the champion of the Nicene Creed. Lieb chooses not to convict or to dismiss the charges of either heresy but leaves the poet in a valley between the certainties of critics. “[O]ne must resist the temptation simply to label Milton as this kind of heretic or that kind of heretic” because “labels of any sort are dangerous” (214). Though there is a practical level of truth in such a maxim, Lieb seems to be making more of a modern point than one characteristic of Milton’s England. Theological labels were certainly the procedure and psychology of seventeenth-century England as is evidenced in anti-heretical royal injunctions and laws and by the explicit language of confessions such as the *Thirty-Nine Articles* and the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, which in their pro-Nicene articles concerning the person of Jesus and the Son in the Trinity were *ipso facto* contra-Socinian and contra-Arian and meant to be so in order to distinguish truth from error.

If there is an overall weakness in *Theological Milton*, it lies in Lieb’s chosen method of defending the premise of the *deus absconditus* past a level recognizable to seventeenth-century defenders of orthodoxy. He has made the hiddenness of God so hidden and Miltonic authorship so uncertain in the treatise that forensic examination becomes untenable concerning the nature of Milton’s God, and of Milton himself (who in effect becomes *Miltonius absconditus*)—and that seems to be his point. “Nothing can be taken for granted [and] we would do well to err on the side of caution rather than to venture conclusions that may come back to haunt us” (278). The three parts of *Theological Milton* overlap and slide upon each other like tectonic plates in such a way that if one accepts Lieb’s premises of the hidden God and the untrustworthiness of Miltonic authorship (as well as the questionable authorship of Arius), one feels the tremors that move one to then doubt the Miltonic sponsorship of the supposed Arian or Socinian qualities of the treatise (if they are truly present at all). And if the treatise is not Milton’s then it is certain that

it cannot safely be used to draw conclusions about the heretical qualities supposedly in *Paradise Lost*. Besides, this method of glossing the epic by the treatise is one that “has been weighed in the balance and found wanting” (15). Lieb does not defend or develop this assertion; he assumes its truth and moves on. I wish he would explicitly have taken on Maurice Kelley’s famous dictum that *Paradise Lost* is “an Arian document” (*This Great Argument*, 1941), but he only does so implicitly by dismissing glossing. And I wish he would have chosen to deal with Michael Bauman who following Kelley’s lead and emphasizing the anathemas appended to the Nicene Creed, concluded: “If what was condemned at Nicea was Arianism, then John Milton was an Arian” (*Milton’s Arianism*, 1987). But Bauman is not mentioned, nor are the anathemas as legitimate determinants of Arianism. Such critics Lieb implicitly dismisses as “Miltonists of the heretical bent” (215) and “the heresy police [who are] ever attentive to the possibility of heterodoxy” (227). His manner of arguing, irenic though it is throughout, bases itself on the comforts of uncertainties, as he has declared. The reader who is ready to label, instead of avoiding labels, is ever aware that Lieb’s cautious phrasing is moving him into the hushed corners of the library, to the quiet shadows where abrupt outbursts regarding knowledge of God are forbidden.

Ernan McMullin, ed. *The Church and Galileo*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2005. xii + 391 pp. \$60.00 cloth / \$30.00 paper. Review by LUCIANO BOSCHIERO.

Galileo’s confrontation with the Catholic Church at the beginning of the seventeenth century regarding his open support for a heliocentric cosmos has long been a source of fascination for historians of science and the subject of countless publications. So why another book on this topic? Between 1981 and 1992, a commission established by Pope John Paul II investigated the theological, scientific, legal and cultural issues related to the so-called “Galileo affair.” While the commission’s report acknowledged the Church’s failure to deal effectively with Copernicanism and Galileo’s work, McMullin argues that the historical accuracy of the report fell short of what most scholars would expect. To address the report’s shortcomings, and in light of new documents found in recently opened archives of the Holy Office, a confer-

ence was organised at the University of Notre Dame in 2002. This book is the result of that conference and its aim is to provide “a more constructive approach” (2) to the Galileo affair by addressing the decisions and actions of all those involved in the events in early seventeenth-century Italy that followed the publication of Copernicus’ *De Revolutionibus* in 1543. In short, it is a book aimed at a specialised audience, promising to shed new light on an old topic.

That said, some readers might be disappointed to find that few of the thirteen chapters in this book actually provide new evidence about the complex relationship between Galileo and the Church authorities. However, the book’s strength lies in the ability of some of its contributing authors to articulate new interpretations of well-known sources and events and to provide a thorough contextual analysis of the Galileo affair. This is done in three parts: Part One examines the initial reactions to Copernicus’ work during the second half of the sixteenth century; Part Two, occupying the majority of the book’s pages, addresses the key issues Galileo and the Church confronted between 1616 and 1633; and Part Three comments on the scientific, political, and religious fallout of Galileo’s condemnation by the Church.

Before Galileo turned his telescope towards the heavens in 1609, Copernicanism had already been at the centre of some heated debates amongst Jesuit, Augustinian and Dominican astronomers and theologians. For example, in Part One of this book, Irving Kelter points out that while Augustinian Didacus à Stunica rejected Copernicanism in 1594, ten years earlier he was prepared to reinterpret key scriptural passages to accommodate Copernicus’ heliocentric claims. Jesuits Nicolaus Serarius, Johannes Lorinus and Johannes de Pineda also considered the mathematical possibility of the mobility of the Earth before rejecting the idea on theological and physical grounds. According to Kelter, the issues discussed by these authors reflect how Jesuits struggled to subordinate the status of the mathematical sciences, such as astronomy, to theology.

Part Two begins with Michael Shank’s insightful analysis of the geopolitical context in which Galileo moved. During the early seventeenth century, the Venetian Republic, the Grand Duchy of Tuscany and the Papal States were all involved in the economic, political and religious struggles between the various forms of Protestantism and Catholicism that eventually led all of Europe into the Thirty Years War (1618-1648). This political context assists

historians in appreciating the pressures Pope Urban VIII faced while confronting calls of condemnation against Galileo and Copernicanism.

Following Shank's attempt to set the political scene, McMullin, and Annibale Fantoli examine the theological arguments at stake in Galileo's *Letter to the Grand Duchess Christina*, as well as the authenticity of the mysterious third document pertaining to Galileo's acquiescence in 1616, and the Church's reasons for placing Copernicus' work on the Holy Index. These are lucid, well-written analyses pertaining to Galileo's all-important first confrontation with the Church authorities in Rome. However, the authors reveal little new about the early moves to silence Galileo on the topic of Copernicanism. There are several unanswered questions regarding the motivations and actions of the individuals involved in the 1616 debate, upon which McMullin and Fantoli only speculate.

Meanwhile, the subsequent chapters in Part Two contain much more original claims. Mariano Artigas, Rafael Martinez and William Shea suggest the possibility that the Inquisition might also have been interested in Galileo's controversial work on atomism. Questions regarding the atomic structure of nature had serious implications for the transubstantiation of the Eucharist. Indeed, in 1983 Pietro Redondi argued that had it not been for the intervention of Pope Urban VIII, Galileo would have been charged with heresy on the basis of his atomistic beliefs. Artigas, Martinez and Shea refer to a manuscript recently discovered in the archives of the Holy Office which sheds more light on the issue and indicates that while Redondi's thesis is not entirely accurate, there is still good reason to believe that atomism was an issue discussed by the Roman inquisitors.

Francesco Beretta also makes an original claim regarding the Church's sensitivity to controversial topics in natural philosophy. Beretta explores the connections between the Church's hard line against Aristotelian denials of the immortality of the soul, and Galileo's trial for his support for heliocentrism. The similarities between the Church's stances on these two issues add another layer of context aiding our understanding of the Church's motivations and aims in the Galileo affair.

Part Three, focusing on Copernican debates after 1633, serves as the book's epilogue. John Heilbron shows that despite the ban on Copernicanism and the condemnation of Galileo, the second half of the seventeenth century still saw an on-going debate, especially amongst Jesuit astronomers

and Italy's physico-mathematicians, on the validity of heliocentrism when compared to scriptural passages.

But the last word in this collection of essays belongs to Michael Sharratt and George Coyne, S.J, who turn the focus back onto the Galileo Commission and Pope John Paul II's adjudication in 1992. While Sharratt laments the Church's inability to create room to manoeuvre when taking its stance on matters to do with natural philosophy, Coyne, interestingly one of the principal researchers on the Galileo Commission, asks what the Commission's results mean for the future of science and religion. Issues raised by both these authors should be of great interest to scholars studying the complexities of the relationship between science and religion since the seventeenth century. However, once again these chapters do not provide much original insight into the Galileo affair.

Amongst the many academic and popular books recently published about the different facets of Galileo's life, it is difficult to find thorough contextual analyses of the Pisan philosopher's works. This collection of essays certainly goes some way towards providing an intellectual and political context for Galileo's confrontation with the Church between the critical years of 1616 and 1633. In the process, it eloquently responds to the shortcomings in the Galileo Commission. But it misses the opportunity to explore the complex relationship during this period between the mixed mathematical sciences (including astronomy), natural philosophy and theology, and how Galileo shaped his claims within these competing disciplines in his attempt to gain credibility and support from theologians, his Medici patrons, and fellow astronomers in other parts of Europe. Nevertheless, this updated synthesis of new sources and new interpretations of the Galileo affair which have come to light in the past ten to fifteen years, is still an important contribution to our understanding of this episode in the history of early modern science.

Massimo Turatto, Stefano Benetti, Luca Zampieri, William Shea, eds. *1604-2004: Supernovae as Cosmological Lighthouses*. Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series, Vol. 342. San Francisco: ASP, 2005. 512 pp. \$77.00. Review by ALESSANDRO GIOSTRA, ACCADEMIA GEORGICA, TREIA.

The proceedings of the international conference, which took place in Padua on 16-19 June 2004 to commemorate the 400th anniversary of the appearance of Kepler's Supernova, are collected in this publication. Part 1 of this volume, "New Stars for a New Astronomy," contains the historical investigations by some leading researchers in the field, who aim at illustrating the importance of that celestial phenomenon for the whole history of science. SN 1604 brought about a great discussion among seventeenth-century astronomers and the contents of that debate render its appearance a pregnant event of the Scientific Revolution.

Kepler's New Star was preceded by other astronomical phenomena, such as SN 1572 and the comet in 1577, which were carefully studied by Tycho Brahe (1546-1601). The research carried out by the Danish astronomer is the subject of the paper by Owen Gingerich, "Tycho Brahe and the Nova of 1572" (3-12). Gingerich, who belongs to the Harvard Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, reports the words expressed by Brahe in order to point out the importance of that celestial novelty: "I was led into such perplexity by the unbelievability of the thing that I began to doubt my own eyes" (3). The inquiries made by Brahe about that new celestial body were among the factors that brought about the definitive crisis of Aristotelian cosmology. Professor Gingerich succeeds in showing how the appearance of the New Star set the Danish scientist on the way of mathematical astronomy, the scientific arrangement that progressively led Brahe to conceive his own innovative conception of the structure of the universe.

Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) studied Kepler's Supernova as well, and it gave the Pisan scientist the opportunity to deliver three public lectures. Galilei's account of the celestial event, which he gave during his Paduan professorship, is illustrated by William R. Shea, Professor at the Cattedra Galileiana di Storia della Scienza at the University of Padua, in his paper "Galileo and the Supernova of 1604" (13-20). In those lectures Galilei indicated the absence of any parallax in order to prove that the new celestial body was undoubtedly beyond the Moon. Therefore, it was a clear contradiction of the incorruptibility of the celestial world, a basic principle of the Aristotelian natural philosophy. Establishing that there was no difference between celestial and terrestrial phenomena allowed Galilei to propose an innovative point of view regarding the nature of SN 1604: it was a mass of exhalations, coming from the elementary zone, which was going off into the upper celestial areas. Galilei

also relied on the possibility of calculating the annual parallax of the New Star in order to give a mathematical demonstration of the Earth's motion around the Sun. However, the actual distance of the Supernova, which he could not grasp anyway, did not allow him to achieve his aim; so, it was the first of his unsuccessful attempts to construct a proof of the Copernican cosmology. In the last section of his paper, Professor Shea deals with *Dialogo de Cexo di Ronchitti* (*The Dialogue of Cexo di Ronchitti*), a work written in the Paduan dialect. It was issued as a response to the work published by Antonio Lorenzini, an obstinate Aristotelian who had rejected any kind of mathematical evidence to preserve the traditional cosmological worldview. In that dialogue, written by both Galileo and his friend Gerolamo Spinelli, two peasants strongly criticize Lorenzini's theories to emphasize mathematical arguments as the only tool for interpreting any kind of phenomenon. William Shea's contribution manages to illustrate the main points of Galilei's investigation about SN 1604.

Anna Lombardi focuses on the relevance of the New Star in "Kepler's Observations of the Supernova of 1604" (21-29). She touches on the event's appearance in the zone of the celestial vault where the conjunction of Mars and Jupiter was occurring. This led astrologers to causally link the New Star to that planetary meeting. Kepler, however, opposed most of the theories supported by judicial astrologers and their way of investigation. His *De Stella Nova in pede Serpentarii* (*The New Star on the Foot of the Serpent Bearer*) is the most important work on SN 1604 and it reflects the mathematical arrangement and rational reasoning of his astronomical research. He also advanced an interpretation founded upon his own pragmatic belief in the role of astrology: God has given human beings a good chance to understand the structure of the universe. Kepler was certainly among those scientists who succeeded in seizing that opportunity.

The issue of Kepler's work on the New Star marked the beginning of an intense debate with the astronomer Helisaeus Roeslin (1545-1616), which Miguel Granada discusses in his paper "The Discussion between Kepler and Roeslin on the Nova of 1604" (30-42). Roeslin acknowledged Kepler's value as a mathematician but he trusted in astrological predictions more than his colleague did. Moreover, Roeslin rejected some of Kepler's cosmological principles, such as his belief in the Copernican theory. So, the event of the New Star gave them the occasion for a discussion concerning their general questions on astronomy. From Roeslin's perspective, the New Star was

caused by the aforementioned Mars-Jupiter conjunction, and its appearance seemed to confirm the predictions he had foretold in a work regarding the conjunction's consequences, which he had written in 1597. As a Copernican, Kepler upheld the vast distance between Saturn and the fixed stars in order to establish that SN 1604 could not have been born as an effect of that planetary meeting. Their different approaches to predictions were connected with their visions of the origin of the New Star. Roeslin trusted in the divine causality and in that kind of phenomenon's fatalistic role in universal changes. Kepler, on the contrary, did not deny the possibility of such assumptions, but he did not consider them to be certainties. Thus, he remained wary of the inevitable effect of the celestial event on the emergence of "prophets and other charlatans who are encouraged by the appearance of this star to undertake some new exploit, as if the Lord God had lit this star in the darkness to light them" (38).

In the last paper belonging to the first part of this volume, Z.R. Wang, Y. Zhao, M. Li, and Q.L. Zhou focus on the observations of "SN 1604 in the East" (48-52). In China it was observed one day later, and in Korea three to four days later than in Europe. According to the yearlong Chinese observations, the "Guest Star" was "as large as a pellet bomb" (49) and it finally extinguished on 7 October 1605. The Korean records are very useful to establish the light curve of SN 1604. Both Eastern and Western observations confirm it to be a Type I Supernova. Indeed, it reached the maximum brightness in a few days; then, it maintained that apparent luminance for some days before it started to diminish, growing fainter more rapidly in the first days of diminution.

The essays in the first part of this publication make it a good introductory treatise for students interested in getting a deeper understanding of the discussion on SN 1604. The relevance of that appearance for the whole history of scientific thought could not allow that anniversary to pass unnoticed. Padua was a research centre of great importance at that time and the debate on the New Star confirmed its fame. Therefore, the June 2004 Paduan conference served as the best way to remember that debate as a crucial moment in modern cosmology.

Charles-Alphonse Dufresnoy. *De Arte Graphica (Paris, 1668)*. Edition, translation and commentary by Christopher Allen, Yasmin Haskell, and Frances Muecke. Geneva, Librairie Droz S. A., 2005. 560 pp. SF 158.00. Review by JOHN A. GALLUCCI, COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

This is a book of rich and important scholarship. Its subject is a slender, difficult, fascinating, and influential Latin poem on the art of painting. This edition provides the first truly authoritative text of the poem, with a clear and precise English translation *en regard*. Commentary and introductions provide the means to appreciate and interpret this poem with depth and understanding. Clearly written, this edition of Dufresnoy will be of major interest to all scholars of art history and literature.

Why should a poem only 549 lines long deserve so much attention from scholars today? The answer is simple: Dufresnoy's poem was an object of enormous attention and influence in its own time, quickly becoming a fundamental reference point for artists and poets and remaining so for over a century in many different lands. This valuable edition brings home to the modern reader this influence, providing or rather restoring a crucial chapter in the history of European art.

It is difficult to do justice to a book that explores in such detail the world of the artist in these centuries. Speaking of its method in general, one can say that the unique qualities of the *De arte graphica* are made clear through the marshalling of classical, Renaissance and contemporary writings on art, and through the study of Dufresnoy's own role as a source of inspiration for poets and painters of the eighteenth century. The three authors provide original assessments of this poem in these contexts. This work's overall thesis can be summed up by Christopher Allen's statement, which this edition demonstrates amply and convincingly: "[Dufresnoy's poem] constitutes perhaps the best and most economical way into the practical and theoretical concerns of artists of the Renaissance and the seventeenth century. And far from being of merely antiquarian interest... [Dufresnoy's poem] contains much to interest painters who come after modernism and after post-modernism, and who are asking, once again, fundamental questions about the art of picturing the world" (62).

The Latin text provided is authoritative. As no manuscript exists, the text of Dufresnoy's poem is based on the first edition of the poem in 1668 by Dufresnoy's friend Pierre Mignard. A critical apparatus allows one to follow various textual changes in subsequent editions. It also includes Dufresnoy's spare and important Latin notes. The translation is clear and precise and will provide for modern readers helpful access to Dufresnoy's technical vocabulary.

The first chapter introduces us to Dufresnoy's life, his long residence in Rome, his friendships and professional relationships, and his own work in painting. Christopher Allen also provides the most likely theory of the poem's origin: it seems to have begun as a series of apothegms that were subsequently transformed into a more finished work. There is a valuable discussion of how the poem may be understood within the received Renaissance tradition and the variations introduced by the Venetian painters. The chapter closes with discussion of the poem's reception in France. Published by Mignard in 1668 in Latin, translated into French by Roger de Piles in 1668, the poem and its author became a part of the polemics between Mignard and Le Brun, as well as the unacknowledged source of Molière's poem celebrating Mignard's *La gloire du Val-de-Grâce* and a possible source for Boileau's *Art Poétique*.

The second chapter introduces us to an important understanding of the neo-Latin tradition in poetry. Dufresnoy's use of Latin is not simply antiquarian but a fundamental part of the poem's creation and appeal, and helps explain its success. Yasmin Haskell discusses Dufresnoy's choice of Latin, the poem's style and mode of composition. She provides valuable remarks on the poem's use of Greek and Latin terms. Of especial interest is the discussion of the relation of *De arte graphica* to Renaissance models, such as Vida's *De arte poetica*, and to contemporary sources that help nuance Dufresnoy's relationship to the Horatian tradition of *ut pictura poesis*. This chapter concludes with a discussion of how Dufresnoy's Latin poem itself engendered a new direction in European Latin poetry. This chapter is especially valuable in its demonstration of the vitality of neo-Latin writing.

The third chapter discusses the fascinating influence and fortune of Dufresnoy's poem in Europe over the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, its "European dissemination." Dufresnoy's poem, in short, was "ubiquitous." Frances Muecke is also interested in why the poem became so successful as it made its way throughout Europe in Italy, Germany, Austria,

England and the Netherlands, everywhere accompanying the creation of art academies and the discussion of the role of the artist and the definition of fine art. Translated by Dryden, read by Pope and Benjamin West, Dufresnoy was “a household name” among the elite in England. In England the first effective challenge to Dufresnoy’s theorizing took place in the essays of the English artist Sir Joshua Reynolds. The chapter extends its remarks into the nineteenth century with a discussion of Turner’s use of Dufresnoy and color theory.

Christopher Allen’s lengthy Commentary forms the major part of this book. He divides the poem into sections, which are then discussed within a wide range of aesthetic writings from Classical, Renaissance and contemporary discussions of art. The poem’s difficulties and vocabulary are illuminated usefully as the reader is informed not only of aesthetic theory, such as that of Alberti, but of actual practice by various painters. Each section is therefore discussed within several layers of context: these will be of major help as scholars come to study further Dufresnoy and work toward developing new interpretations of *De arte graphica*.

The six Appendices provide documents that are fundamental for the appreciation of the importance and meaning of *De arte graphica*. One has at hand documents demonstrating the poem’s reception and biographical documents important for understanding the poem’s origins. Of especial value are remarks by Dufresnoy himself, in French, some of which have only been recently discovered. Two French translations of the *De arte graphica* are also included, one published here for the first time and completely unknown until discovered by the authors in 1997.

Overall, we have a work remarkable for its careful erudition and usefulness. The writing of the three editors of this text remains clear and eminently readable throughout. The result is a thorough introduction to a poem and its essential connections to the development of European painting, and a demonstration of the importance of the neo-Latin poetic tradition.

Charles M. Natoli. *Fire in the Dark: Essays on Pascal’s Pensées and Provinciales*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2005. ix + 145 pp. \$ 75.00 / £ 45.00. Review by SUSAN READ BAKER, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA.

Six of the eight chapters comprising this book have been published earlier, between 1989 and 2003. The present volume is thus the result of a long-term project gradually brought to fruition. Framed by an opening and afterword, and accompanied by an abbreviated chronology, a select bibliography, an index of names, and several useful pages concerning editions and previous studies of the *Pensées* and *Provinciales*, all six chapters have been revised and one considerably enlarged according to Natoli. Modestly presented as “readings and reflections” (ix), these essays have been produced for general readers and specialists alike. They are enjoyable to read, as well as thought-provoking.

Natoli informs the reader that his introduction and conclusion constitute a “Pascal-centered reflection on the philosophy of religion” (xii). Pascal’s existential portrayal of the human condition has maintained into our own time its original force and incisiveness. In the *Apology of the Christian religion* that Pascal never finished, this portrait aimed to bring the reader to self-understanding by furnishing glimpses into the true nature of a hidden God. Hence Pascal’s fundamental focus on “the question of who God is” (8). Following Laurent Thirouin, Natoli views the famous wager for the existence of God as a prologue to Pascal’s injunction that the unbeliever seek the nature of the Christian God. This Christian God, moreover, has a specific nature: He is the “Hidden God” of Augustine, whose thought permeated the views and writings of so many in the early modern period in France. The bulk of Natoli’s introduction thus delivers a succinct, precise, and lucid account of the tenets of Augustine’s theology which will imbue both the *Pensées* and the *Provinciales*.

Part Two of Natoli’s study consists of three chapters devoted to the *Provinciales*. Both the historical context and the content of Pascal’s great polemic are magisterially explored. The reader of these letters, according to Natoli, undergoes a process of seduction which is not altogether free of bias, despite claims to the contrary. Pascal’s sometimes-unfair attack on the Jesuits’ morality is fueled by his conviction that their wicked and scandalous logic must be rebutted by an equally scandalous disclosure of their laxism and accommodation to worldly corruption. Following a remarkably even-handed treatment of Pascal’s refusal to accept innovation in religious practice—a refusal matched by the Jesuits’ movement away from the morality preached by the Fathers of the Church—Natoli points out the drawbacks of Pascal’s

strategy. By seeking to predicate Christian conviction and practice on Augustine's writings, Pascal overlooks Augustine's assertion that the Church trumps his own authority. By condemning the Jansenist view of faith, "the Church effectively condemned the teaching of Saint Augustine as well" (63).

Turning to the *Pensées* in the three pithy chapters of Part III, Natoli addresses three familiar, yet pivotal questions: the role of rhetoric, the concept of justice, and the dialectic of speech and silence in Pascal's thought. Natoli convincingly argues in his fifth essay that "reason is a power that persuades, and that persuasive power is proof" (70). Proof, therefore, is not demonstration, since it can forego reason and spring instead from custom, habit, and the testimony of the heart. Included in this discussion are a luminous contrast drawn between Pascal and Descartes, a diagram and analysis of proofs drawn from within and without according to Pascal's notion of argument, and a discussion of the problem of induction. In chapter six, divine justice is presented as an inscrutable but fundamental aspect of Pascal's Hidden God. Identified with God's very will, His justice is basic to Pascal's apologetics and the paradoxical presentation of mankind's fallen nature in the *Pensées*. Christianity is thus shrouded in mysteries which it alone, presumably, can account for. Finally, in his seventh essay, Natoli takes up the topic of the "*Pensées's* speaking silences" (109). Chief among these is the mystical experience of the *nuît de feu* commemorated in the celebrated and talismanic *Mémorial*. Following a close textual analysis, Natoli concludes that this relic arguably reveals Pascal's conviction that human speech cannot convey the ineffable nature of the Hidden God. The ultimate paradox of the *Pensées*, as Sarah Meltzer has also noted (her work, curiously, is not mentioned by Natoli), is that the unspeakable lies at the very heart of Pascal's projected *Apologie pour la religion chrétienne*.

Natoli's conclusion draws together in eloquent fashion the various strands of his previous readings of Pascal. He insists once more on the enigmatic nature of divine justice *vis-à-vis* the real presence of evil in the sub-lunar world. He invokes the Pascalian command to love God rather than to seek to know Him, and to seek the light of God's truth, according to Jesus's statement that those who search for that truth have already found it.

This is a well-crafted, erudite, and engaging study which eschews jargon without turning aside from the hard questions posed to the modern reader by Pascal's best-known texts. Natoli underscores both the age-old sway of

Pascal's thought and those anachronistic elements which make it seem so alien today. His work should find a broad audience among students of philosophy, the history of religion, theology, and French letters and culture.

Georges Forestier. *Essai de génétique théâtrale: Corneille à l'oeuvre*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2004. 387 pp. SF 28.00. Review by JOHN D. LYONS, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA.

This is a high-quality facsimile republication of the first edition of this work (published in Paris by Klincksieck in 1996) in the smaller format *Titre courant* series. A re-edition would not necessarily merit a review, but given Forestier's meteoric ascension to a position of uncontested dominance in the French academic study of seventeenth-century French theatre, it is important that this title both remain in print (now that Klincksieck is out of business) and be appreciated as the start of a lively new current in the history of dramatic literature. Since first writing this *Essai*, Forestier has gone on to edit the new Pléiade edition of Racine's dramatic works, to write an overview of seventeenth-century dramatic theory (*Passions tragiques et règles classiques*, 2003) and a huge biography of Racine (*Jean Racine*, 2006). He is now directing the new Pléiade edition of Molière's works, and thus decisively influencing, for a whole generation, the study of the three major dramatists of seventeenth-century France. Moreover, the significance of the *Essai de génétique théâtrale* is different today from what it was a decade ago, even though not a word has changed. We can now see in it something that became abundantly clear only in the Pléiade Racine. Forestier challenges one of the most entrenched principles of literary history, the privilege generally given to the last edition published during the author's lifetime and, even beyond that, the acceptance of traditions of reading which transform our views of an author by selecting certain works for the canon and by rejecting others into obscurity. By preferring instead the first edition of Racine's plays, Forestier's Pléiade edition directs attention back to the historic moment of initial publication with a view to restoring a vision of what the work was at the moment it first appeared and, in many cases, created literary and cultural turmoil.

The *Essai de génétique théâtrale* places Corneille's work as writer at the center. Such an approach is not as obvious as it may seem; Forestier sets himself against the large number of critical and literary-historical works that prefer to describe and evaluate Corneille's drama, like that of other "classical" authors, through a filter of thematics, politics, and psychology. These filters correspond to the interests of the reader and her or his cultural moment rather than to the specific situation of Corneille. Although it may at first glance be quite different from what is generally understood as the historical or new historicist criticism, Forestier's approach is in fact doubly historical. It attempts to place Corneille within the world of his period but then, instead of seeing him as "representative" in some general sense of his epoch, of his gender, or of his class, it endeavors to look at the characteristic that made Corneille stand out as different, and thus specific, within that period: his unusual success at dramatic writing.

In studying how Corneille wrote, Forestier sets himself the task of determining the problems facing the author with each new subject. Forestier makes use of Corneille's statements about composition in texts such as prefaces, dedicatory letters, *examens* (written for the 1660 edition of Corneille's collected dramatic works and giving retrospective commentary on the plays from the period 1632 to 1660), and the three *Discours* on dramatic poetry (which appeared also in the 1660 edition), a resource that Forestier calls the "*inestimable appareil critique et théorique*" (29) left by the playwright, as well as contemporary texts by Corneille's fellow dramatists and critics. These resources have been available to readers for over three centuries and have been the basis for such admirable studies as Marie-Odile Sweetser's 1962 study *Les conceptions dramatiques de Corneille d'après ses écrits théoriques*. Yet Forestier makes an entirely new and brilliantly creative use of these sources by looking at the plays themselves with a new and speculative eye. He simply imagines himself in the position of Corneille writing play after play, each with a different compositional challenge.

Forestier's procedure is based on an insight that will be familiar to many readers of French structuralist criticism, and particularly to those who recall Gérard Genette's influential essay "Plausibility and motivation" (published in *Figures II* in 1969—significantly Genette himself was first a scholar of seventeenth-century French literature): that the reader's (or spectator's) point of view on the story sequence is opposite that of the writer. The reader, for

instance, will think, or rather feel, that love or jealousy or a chance encounter causes what happens later in the plot. The writer, on the other hand (according to Forestier), looks at the desired plot outcome and then arranges the earlier elements of the sequence to lead to, and to justify, the outcome, whether comic or tragic. As Forestier notes, sometimes the only historic “fact” included in a tragedy by Corneille is the denouement; so that the playwright’s work is to write what we would call the back-story by freely inventing a set of supposed events that would plausibly lead to such an ending.

It would be difficult to convey in any detail the account Forestier gives of the writing of such plays as *Le Cid*, *Rodogune*, *Don Sanche d’Aragon*, *Polyeucte*, and *Cinna*. Ranging over the full gamut of Corneille’s dramatic writing, and not confining himself to the small fraction of plays that entered the traditional canon, Forestier gives a lively and persuasive narrative of how Corneille set and then met specific compositional challenges. The book is not a play-by-play consideration, however, but rather a problem-by-problem approach. Concepts such as “deduction” and “reduction,” “doxal causality” and “logical causality,” “tragic matrix” and “embellishment” are introduced and illustrated by examples from the plays alongside more familiar terms like plausibility, decorum, and character coherence.

This reading of Corneille’s theatre, like all criticism, is based on a series of argued hypotheses, buttressed by documentation and usually determined by the detection of recurrent patterns. We cannot know, for instance, what went through the playwright’s mind when he chose to have Rodogune ask Cléopâtre’s sons to kill their mother when he composed *Rodogune*. Perhaps, as critics inspired by psychoanalysis might have it, the playwright was swayed by unconscious misogynistic pulsions. Forestier’s preference is to see the writer as a professional who sought to make rational and conscious decisions with a view of attracting and satisfying an audience. He consistently presents Corneille as the artisan of literary and aesthetic, rather than psychological and political, creations. Throughout, Forestier is rigorously historical. This is a refreshing, powerful, and thoroughly informative work. Whether readers choose to emulate Forestier in their own approach to Corneille, it is clear that this critic’s work must be reckoned with.

Luduvine Goupillaud. *De l'or de Virgile aux ors de Versailles: Métamorphoses de l'épopée dans la seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle en France*. Travaux du Grand Siècle 25. Geneva: Droz, 2005. 394 pp. SF 170.00. Review by TOM CONLEY, HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

The ambition of this book is to discern the presence of the *Aeneid* in French literary circles in the reign of Louis XIV. The author argues that Virgil was present but not always obvious to the poets, artists, architects and orators who defined France's classical age. That the nation sought to define itself by an *epic* was less evident than its prevailing desire to be known by a founding "heroic poem." Goupillaud shows that a first generation of *inheritors* of Virgil gives way to a coterie of "prodigal sons" who evince a quasi-oedipal relation with the Latin poet. In the age of the *Querelle* a last group of "freed slaves" (*affranchis*) rejects the patrimony at the same time it fashions Virgil in its treatment of the painterly and architectural character of Versailles.

At the beginning of the century the *Ratio studiorum* heralds Cicero and Quintillien as the incarnation of eloquence; soon after Horace becomes a prism through which, finally, the *Aeneid* is read and appreciated. For the *modernes* at the other end, sublimity of taste or *goût* inspires intimate knowledge of a work, a knowledge that goes beyond rules and, like genius, is made clear for an infinite number of readers. It is by way of taste that Virgil is eventually assimilated. The literary world had first known a French Virgil through what Goupillaud calls Segrais's "ethnocentric translation" (Books I-VI, 1668; Books VII-XII, 1681) in which he is at odds about how to transpose classical civilization into terms that satisfy contemporary aesthetic norms. Comparative treatment of Segrais with translations by Perrin (1658) and Marolles (1662) reveals that the resistance of the Latin inspires reflection on "the very nature of beauty in art and on the almost totally impenetrable mystery of literary creation" (54). On another level readers pondered the nature of Aeneas, an emblem of perfection but also a mix of bellicosity and gallantry; he was a man, Segrais had shown, both timid and ungracious. So too did the structure of the poem cause perplexity; yet its mystery, indeed its writing of rapture, did not fail to amaze the French public. As the century bore on, the sublimity of the epic style became the matter with which new poetry of tragedy could be conceived, as shown in Racine's crafting of Virgilian lines in the contained expression of savagery in his greatest plays.

Counted among the prodigal sons at the beginning of the 1660s are Desmarets de Saint Sorlin, Nicolas Courtin, Père Charles la Rue, and others who use the *Aeneid* for the ends of pedagogy. Fénelon's *Télémaque* (1698) sums up a relation of admiration and deviation. The child and Mentor remain close to and far from the classical prototype of exemplary voyage. Fénelon's indirect imitation of the *Aeneid* "seeks to express a love for the epic genre" (249). Among the *affranchis*, writes Gouppillaud (in part three of the book-dissertation), are those who engage in the *Querelle*. Virgil becomes French and leaves aside his Latin trappings in a context in which Le Laboureur writes his *Avantages de la langue française sur la langue latine* (1667), Desmarets de Saint-Sorlin issues his *Comparaison de la langue & de la poésie française avec la grecque & la latine* (1670), and Charles Perreault launches his *Parallèle des Anciens & Modernes en ce qui regarde les arts & les sciences* (1688). The *Aeneid* loses its sacred aura and is demystified at the same time it remains a model of heroic verse. The epic inspires reflection on the design of the novel as it had developed from d'Urfé to Scudéry, such that the new genre remains a variant of the epic (318).

The final chapter takes up the ways that the order, arrangement, and symmetry of the *Aeneid* inspire some of the sublimities of Versailles. Taken in its broadest sense, the artifice that Charles Le Brun engineers "consists in spatializing a debate, by marrying a promenade through Versailles to literary controversy" (334). Thus Madeleine de Scudéry's *Promenade de Versailles* can be seen as a spatial poem in which the measure of the palace bears comparison both with what the authors represent and the movement of their personages. Gouppillaud notes how architecture is tied to certain kinds of discourse and causes narrative to become spatialized: "a petrified and petrifying metaphor, Versailles is above all an image stripped of the contours on which the eye of the stroller-as-reader endlessly wanders" (354).

Gouppillaud's book is an exhaustive and comprehensive picture of the French literary world in the golden years of the reign of Louis XIV. The author shows that Virgil was far more internalized than held as a model that inspired imitation or adaptation. In a telling epigraph she recalls Madame de Sévigné's impressions of a forge she had witnessed upon return from a thermal cure at Vichy. She relates to Madame de Grignan that "we went into a veritable inferno" in which "we discovered eight or ten Cyclops" hammering out not Aeneas's arms but anchors destined for ships. The workers were

drenched with sweat, their mustached faces pale under their long and black hair (7). Sévigné transposes into her own words the vigor and rhythm of the workers at the forge: *Illi inter ses multa vi brachia tollunt/ In numerum* (Book VIII, 451-52). Virgil effectively occludes the woman's sidelong glimpse of French military policy and latent social contradiction.

From the beginning to the end of *De l'or de Virgile* the reader discovers the ubiquity and complexity of the Virgilian poem in classical France. The author moves through a variety of authors and situations in which the nature of patrimony and the resistance it inspires give rise to the great works of the seventeenth-century vernacular canon. If any criticism can be brought to this epic study it would be in the paratextual domain. The author, working through myriad authors and works both major and minor, leaves the reader with a half-page index that does little justice to the research. And insofar as the book carries neither acknowledgment nor expression of debt to anyone, the reader wonders if Virgil and the classical age are felt to be of a gloriously self-contained genealogy. In all events every student of Virgil in seventeenth-century France will take this book as an enduring point of reference in the years to come.

Paul Crenshaw. *Rembrandt's Bankruptcy: The Artist, His Patrons, and the Art Market in Seventeenth-Century Netherlands*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006. xiv + 221 pp. + 39 illus. \$80.00. Review by H. PERRY CHAPMAN, UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE.

Rembrandt declared bankruptcy in 1656, when he was fifty years old. Ever since Filippo Baldinucci commented on its rarity, in 1686 (in one of the first biographies of Rembrandt), critics have factored Rembrandt's bankruptcy into their assessments of his life and work, often without fully understanding it. Consequently the interpretation of Rembrandt's *cessio bonorum*—ceding of goods to the municipality to be sold for the benefit of his creditors—serves as a barometer of Rembrandt's shifting critical fortunes. Baldinucci attributed Rembrandt's insolvency to his eccentric, excessive collecting of art and to his buying back his own prints to inflate their prices, which he considered symptomatic of Rembrandt's larger eccentricity. Recent critics, depending on their view of Rembrandt, have interpreted the bankruptcy as, alterna-

tively, the fallout of his social climbing or a mark of his independent genius. Others, wanting to make Rembrandt more like his contemporaries, have treated his “near-bankruptcy” as a minor and not all that unusual episode in an oversaturated art market and declining economy.

In *Rembrandt's Bankruptcy*, Paul Crenshaw provides a detailed, in-depth assessment of Rembrandt's finances and makes sensible suggestions about their impact on his artistic production. The bankruptcy is at the center of his project, which is modeled after the economic approach of—and makes a fine tribute to—the late John Michael Montias. Yet to understand the causes and effects of Rembrandt's financial disaster, Crenshaw investigates Rembrandt's economic life as a whole, drawing on the substantial documentary evidence, as well as on Rembrandt's works. Much of this documentary evidence, whether long-known or more recently discovered by the Amsterdam archivists I. H. van Eeghen and S. A. C. Dudock van Heel, is familiar to specialists and little of it is previously un-published. However, with determined sleuthing and cautious reasoning, Crenshaw makes important new connections and more sense than ever before of a complex puzzle. He details how Rembrandt's bankruptcy was caused by a pattern of financial recklessness: Rembrandt bought and then failed to pay off an expensive house (today's Rembrandthuis Museum); he spent lavish sums collecting art and on the paraphernalia of his studio and *kunstkamer*, even when he was in financial difficulty; and he frequently failed to conform to his clients' expectations or meet their demands. Then, when faced with financial ruin in the mid 1650s, Rembrandt's “manner of evading his responsibility to his creditors was so socially disreputable that laws in Amsterdam were quickly altered to prevent such actions” (2). Crenshaw concludes that Rembrandt was as unconventional in his handling of money as he was in his art. Thus he argues compellingly, as Baldinucci (and others) had maintained from the beginning, that Rembrandt was highly independent and singularly unconstrained by rules, whether artistic or financial.

Crenshaw's first three chapters provide the context for his study. Chapter 1 examines the historiography of Rembrandt's bankruptcy. Chapter 2 establishes the norms of the time by contrasting Rembrandt's financial woes with those of other Dutch artists, some of whom may have similarly chaffed at the constraints of the art market. In 1639, when he settled on his expensive house, Rembrandt, a successful painter in high demand, must have seemed as if he could handle a real estate stretch. Chapter 3 sets out how his circum-

stances changed. A decline in his production and income in the 1640s coincided with both personal misfortune, most notably the death of his wife Saskia, and a broader economic downturn in the Dutch Republic, and was then compounded by behavior that likely “hurt his standing in the eyes of the community.” Though to a large extent Crenshaw here rehearses familiar ground, the overall picture of the relation between Rembrandt’s financial instability and his professional vicissitudes is essential preparation for the next three chapters, which concentrate on the specific factors leading to Rembrandt’s insolvency.

Chapter 4 zeros in on the house and its repercussions. As a young man just starting out, Rembrandt lent 1000 guilders to Hendrick Uylenburgh, the art dealer with whom he worked and lodged between 1632 and 1635; for the rest of his life, however, Rembrandt would be a borrower. While Crenshaw asserts that “Rembrandt’s descent into financial hardship had one clear catalyst: he did not pay off the house on the Sint Antonisbreestraat,” the complexities of his indebtedness necessitate that this chapter be “a biographical account of Rembrandt’s life in his Breestraat home, a period that began with him enjoying the height of artistic fame and fortune, and ended with him reduced to bankruptcy” (44). This chapter entails a scrupulous account of the house’s declining value (its neighborhood was losing its appeal), of the disruption and disputes arising from the replacement of the pilings supporting the house next door, and of the complex of deals into which Rembrandt entered in his ultimately failed efforts to stave off ruin and keep his house. Crenshaw, however, gives relatively short shrift to Rembrandt’s need or desire for such a house. As a result its purchase is made to seem more irresponsible or irrational than it may have been. At a time when distinguished *liefhebbers* (art lovers) were in the habit of visiting artists’ studios, whether to look and converse, to buy, or to have their portraits painted, suitable reception rooms may have seemed as necessary as the spaces needed for Rembrandt’s painting, printmaking, studying (hence the *kunstkamer*), probable art dealing, book keeping, and instruction of many students. Too, in a decade when Rembrandt was intensively crafting his own image through his self-portraits, he must have been well aware that for some renowned artists of the recent past—Raphael, Vasari and, in Amsterdam, Cornelis Ketel—the house had become a mark of professional standing and its decoration had become a vehicle for pictorial art theory. Surprisingly, given Rembrandt’s interest in and emulation of Peter

Paul Rubens during the 1630s, Crenshaw makes no mention of Rubens' grand house in Antwerp.

"Rembrandt's Collecting Habit" is an apt title for chapter 5. The extent and variety of Rembrandt's collection of paintings, prints, and drawings, of antiquities and rarities, and of naturalia have long been known, thanks to the inventory that was made (with Rembrandt's help) at the time of his bankruptcy. Crenshaw's contribution is to spell out just how insatiable Rembrandt was in his acquisition of art. At a time when collecting was in vogue—Rubens had a virtually unsurpassed collection of art and antiquities; it was not unusual for an Amsterdam merchant's house to be hung with 50 to 100 contemporary paintings—Rembrandt stands out for his drive to amass (and spend) more and more, even in the face of alarmingly mounting debts. Given Rembrandt's lack of control and, as with the house, consuming desire—he paid the highest recorded price for a single seashell—Crenshaw might have taken a more expansive approach and looked into the psychology of collecting.

Chapter 6 details Rembrandt's disputes with several prominent clients. From three case studies, Crenshaw concludes that "When faced with challenges to his artistic autonomy and to the quality of his products, Rembrandt retaliated with consistent resolve As a result of his contrary behavior and inconvenient business practices, he offended many patrons directly and made others wary of coming to him at all" (133). In short, Crenshaw argues compellingly that Rembrandt resisted and willfully ignored the constraints that commerce by necessity imposes on art. As Baldinucci and other near-contemporaries recognized, by refusing to play by the financial rules, Rembrandt asserted his artistic autonomy. What this meant in practice is the subject of chapter 7, which looks at some of the complex effects of Rembrandt's money problem on specific works of art and comes to the jarring conclusion that, post-bankruptcy, the paintings and prints that came about because of financial obligations "include some of the master's most acclaimed work" (155). Indeed, Rembrandt used some of these pictures to pay off his creditors.

Rembrandt's Bankruptcy investigates a microcosm of the intersection between the driving forces of the economy and the idiosyncratic needs and desires of an individual artist and thus contributes significantly to our understanding of the intricacies of a small but crucial segment of the newly open seventeenth-century art market.

D.W. Hayton. *Ruling Ireland, 1685-1742: Politics, Politicians and Parties*. Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2004. xiii+304 pp. \$90.00. Review by KAY J. BLALOCK, AT ST. LOUIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE AT MERAMEC.

In this study, D.W. Hayton provides a concise and comprehensive study of Irish political history from the reign of James II through the ministry of Robert Walpole. A result of thirty years of scholarly endeavor, these selections examine the development, evolution, and complexities of the Irish political structure built within a British-designed complex. What makes Professor Hayton's work not only a valuable read but unique is its emphasis on the political players in Ireland as active rather than passive participants in the making and administration of British policy in governing Ireland. A shift from the traditional perspective and contextual grounding offers new answers to some old questions.

The first of eight chronologically arranged chapters examines the effects of the Jacobite and Williamite "revolutions" on Ireland. The outgoing king, James II, attempting to establish a base of operations and support, played to the interests of Catholics in Ireland much more so than in England. Not only did this result in an increasing alienation between Catholics and Protestants in Ireland, but it also emphasized the importance of specific community interests in Ireland over monarchial and parliamentary goals. King William's victory, however, destroyed "the Irish catholic interest as a political force" (31). Irish Catholic interests did not disappear but the political emphasis had indeed shifted.

The evolution of party politics in Ireland from 1692-1704 constitutes the focus of the second chapter. Geography, alliances, and personal interest become the factors affecting a homogeneous political entity in Ireland, even among the protestant supporters of the new monarch, King William. Likewise, remaining Jacobites placed personal rather than collective interests at the forefront of their political maneuverings. Though the Treaty of Limerick acted as the catalyst in the development of Irish political parties (pro-treaty v. anti-treaty), to focus on this and ignore other factors, as most historians have done, is too simple an explanation. Professor Hayton reexamines and refutes the traditional interpretation of party development by shifting the perspective and acknowledging the complexities of Irish politics as the players in Ireland looked to their own needs and interests in lieu of those of the monarch or

English parliament. The power play between the Hon. Henry, 1st Baron, Capel, and Sir Charles Porter as well as the major players in this political drama are identified. At the end of the chapter a list of Irish MPs appears, and “the names of those members whose political allegiances seem . . . to have remained consistent since 1695” are highlighted. One must be careful to distinguish between Irish Whigs and English Whigs. The development of a Tory party in Ireland also has distinct characteristics. Not until the reign of Queen Anne were “Irish parties . . . indistinguishable from their English counterparts” (35).

Chapters three and four respectively examine the beginnings of the “undertaker system” and high churchmen in the Irish convocation. The “undertaker system” provided the English government with a means by which they could manage the Irish parliament. Irish politicians who provided “the government with a parliamentary majority in return for a voice in policy making and a substantial portion of official patronage for themselves and their dependants” came to be known as “undertakers” (106). Like with other chapters in this study, Professor Hayton’s examination of the “undertaker system” deviates from the norm. While the traditional view sees the system as “a reform devised and imposed from without,” this interpretation looks at it from inside, from an Irish perspective, once again presenting Irish politicians as active rather than passive players in the political process (107).

The high churchmen who met in convocation from 1704-1713, the “undocumented majority,” and their role in party politics provide the subject for chapter four. Once more Professor Hayton offers a different interpretation. “It would be misleading,” he writes, “to follow contemporary whig [sic] critics in representing the high church movement in Ireland as an infection brought into the country by English immigrants” (143). The history of the Church of Ireland differs significantly from that of its counterpart in England. Additionally, circumstances in Ireland affect the shaping of the church’s influence in the political process in ways that have no similarities in England. In other words, the “political and social realities” in Ireland should not be ignored in any study that proposes to examine how Ireland is governed. “Undoubtedly the most significant distinguishing characteristic of the Church of Ireland was its numerical inferiority” (146). With the Catholics in the South, the Scottish Presbyterians and other dissenters in the North, the Church of Ireland found itself in the minority; the same could not be said for the Church

of England. Different factors demand recognition and a reinterpretation based on those factors:

In secular politics, it was the relative importance accorded by each party to the Threats posed to the establishment by catholics and presbyterians which formed the basis of the divisions between whig and tory in Ireland. . . . The high churchmen were primarily party-political animals” (154; 157).

The next three chapters continue with the different perspective, alternate interpretation focus.

Decline of a tory ministry and the shift to a whig commitment with the ascension of George I finds its way into Irish politics. England reacts rather than acts regarding Ireland with its misperception that a jacobite conspiracy is in the makings. As more Scottish immigrants settle in Ireland, Anglican anxiety increases. Language issues (should proselytizing occur in Gaelic or English) and the fact that more privileges and opportunities exist in Ireland than in England for dissenters (especially Presbyterians) affect the political debate surrounding the question of the sacramental test. And British whig ministers handling of the Irish question tended to be superficial. “Soothing the Irish parliament . . . became the central purpose of policy after 1714” (214). But the need for strong leadership to access changing parliamentary politics in Ireland, for the most part, was not forthcoming. This inability or unwillingness to recognize Ireland in its own right would continue with the ministry of Sir Robert Walpole, whose administration is the subject of chapter eight.

The title of the last chapter, “A Remote Part of the King’s Dominions,” expresses the attitude of the Walpole administration. The classic response to Irish grievances remained England’s insistence that all Irish problems stemmed from their determination “to ‘shake off’ the[ir] kingdom’s ‘dependency’ on England” (239). The flawed policy based on this insistence, according to Professor Hayton, should have been recognized and avoided. The so-called success of the Walpole administration did not penetrate below the surface; the stability that had indeed existed during this period under study, had shattered by the mid-1700s. What D.W. Hayton adeptly suggests and proves in *Ruling Ireland* is the importance of perspective, context, and the fact that stability does not constitute a stagnant political structure or history.

Debra Meyers. *Common Whores, Vertuous Women and Loving Wives*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003. ii+210+3 illus. \$39.95. Review by MARTHA OBERLE, FREDERICK COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

In the Introduction to *Common Whores, Vertuous Women and Loving Wives*, Professor Meyers sets out 3 theories: that studying women in colonial America will offer insight into their sisters in England; that the women of Maryland can be separated into two groups, the Predestinarians and the Free Will Christian Women, and that these two groups believed and acted very differently.

In the interactive communities that were early Maryland, the Free Will Christian Women are the Roman Catholics, the Arminian Anglicans and the Quakers. The Predestinarians are the Puritans. According to Meyers, the difference between the groups is predicated on their soteriology, their view of Redemption. The Puritans hold for predestination whereas the Free Will group believes that salvation is earned, that good works matter. The insights into their life styles and the conclusions drawn depend primarily on 3190 wills drawn between 1634 and 1713. Examination indicates that these wills were anything but a standard form with nothing more than names and dates supplied for the particular instance. Other sources include probate and court records, letters, sermons, and genealogical tables.

The first chapter traces the foundation of Maryland. George Calvert sought his patent not only to offer English Roman Catholics a place to worship freely but also to extend the trade and possessions of the mother country. Despite the failure of his first effort in Newfoundland, the loss of his first wife and several of their children, and his own rude reception in Virginia, Calvert persisted, and Charles I granted a patent in June of 1632 to George Calvert's son, Cecil, who, following his father's death, had succeeded to the title of Lord Baltimore. Significantly, the charter granted to the Calverts made their holding a county palatine, which is to say that the Calverts had absolute power in their colony: their authority in their own land was the equivalent of royal prerogative.

One might think that a colony devoted to religious tolerance would be peaceful. Such was not the case. The colonists argued with the non-resident Lord Baltimore and his resident representative over the establishment of laws and practices and then fought among themselves once the laws were established. As with all of England, the brewing civil war in the mother country

had repercussions. The death of Leonard Calvert, governor of the colony, in June of 1649 followed the beheading of Charles II by some six months. The executrix of Leonard Calvert's estate was Margaret Brent on whose skillful management the public safety and quite possibly the survival of the colony depended. In the following decades, despite the political strife, the colony carried out the Calvert policies of religious tolerance and commercial development.

In several quite surprising chapters, Meyers examines the colonists' private lives; their religion in terms of belief, architecture, ritual, and gender role; property transfer and rights, and, finally, the public authority of women.

The family unit is the basis of early Maryland society but, unsurprisingly, not all marital unions were happy or faithful. One colonist referred to his notorious wife as a "common whore" (40); he was not alone in his suffering for land parcels with names such as "Cuckold's Delight" and "Cuckold's Mess" (56) are not in short supply. Several civil points are involved: separation was expensive and time consuming to obtain a man had to support his wife's child, and a wife inherited 1/3 of her husband's estate.

Meyers offers many instances of "loveing wives," women who were acknowledged as such by the very words of their husbands' wills. Free Will Christian Women were bequeathed goods or land or both and they had the right and the responsibility to control, manage, and bequeath what they owned. These women also served as their husbands' executors and might be named guardians of children, both their own and those of others. Again came significant responsibility because offspring, including the unborn from the time of quickening, were considered children (57), and children were capable of inheriting. Meyers does not often find Predestinarian women named as heirs to land or executors of wills.

The "vertuous women" of Meyers study whose acts include building and/or supporting chapels either on their own lands or on church owned plots, instructing children, and among the Quakers, leading the Congregation. Meyers offers the example of Mary Taney who persuaded Charles II and the Archbishop of Canterbury to send money—500 pounds—, supplies, and a priest for the Anglican Arminian community. Henrietta Maria Neale, wealthy by inheritance and marriage as well as her own skillful management and purchase of additional lands, became a sought after councilor in civic and church affairs. Ann Chew and Ann Galloway, respected Quaker members

of the Maryland colony, were known for their charitable deeds as well as for preaching and evangelizing; Meyers finds nothing of the sort for the Calvinist women.

Generally speaking, Meyers work is convincing and her points that this period and similar records deserve further research are well taken. Her footnotes are full, and her bibliography extensive. In particular, this book is a slow and demanding read because each facet of the study is examined from four perspectives.

This reader has two quibbles. In discussing the samplers of Calvinist and Free Will Christian Women, Meyers notes the alphabets and Scriptural quotations of the Puritans and the maps, including longitude lines, of the Free Will group. Longitude becomes a practical concept (Dava Sobel, *Longitude*) a bit later than the scope of this study.

Secondly, in her Conclusion, Meyers notes that by the mid 1800's the inheritance pattern in Maryland had changed: far more men than women inherit land, a shift from the Free Will pattern to that of the Predestinarians. She notes that the male/female ratio has equalized and that Maryland has had an influx of immigrants of various religious beliefs; both factors had to affect society. Yet Meyers finds the Free Will group strong enough to found, in 1799, Georgetown Visitation Convent—still in existence today—as training ground for their girls. Here this reader would have liked to see a few more bits of history added to the mix for by the 1790's Maryland was no longer a colony and freedom of religion had become part of a new Constitution. Despite the Toleration Act of 1688 (96), and with the Calvinists in control in 1689, Catholics in the colony were excluded from civil and military offices (36) and Maryland became a royal colony under William and Mary in 1692 (36). In 1695, St. Peter's manse explodes; in the same year the center of government moves from St. Mary's City to Annapolis (36-7). St. Mary's was abandoned (Dr. Lois Green Carr. St. Mary's City Website). Perhaps the power of the Protestant crown was less tolerant than the vision of George and Cecil Calvert.

Susan J. Barnes, Nora De Poorter, Oliver Millar, Horst Vey. *Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press for The Paul Mellon Centre, 2004. x + 692 pp. 202 color images, 603 B&W images. Cloth, large format (9³/₄" x 12"). \$175, £125. With slipcase. Review by MAUREEN E. MULVIHILL, PRINCETON RESEARCH FORUM, PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.

Students of Van Dyck's large corpus of paintings and sketches, from Bellori (1672) to Glück (1931) and Erik Larsen (1988), have taken pains over the centuries to represent the Flemish master's *œuvre* with exactitude and with some sense of the man's special gifts, as well as his (elusive) character, career, patronage, and clientele. But only now, in the first decade of the 21st Century, advantaged by a rich harvest of relatively recent delvings into seventeenth-century culture, have art historians been in place to confidently compile a "complete" *catalogue raisonné* of Van Dyck's paintings. This handsomely produced catalogue, flawlessly printed in Singapore and assembled in a stunning large-format volume for the Paul Mellon Centre and Yale University Press by an international team of four distinguished art historians, is a monumental achievement on the life and career of a famous, international artist, second only in mastery and reputation to Peter Paul Rubens. "Our aim in this volume," writes the catalogue's four collaborators, "is to produce a Catalogue Raisonné of works in oil by Anthony van Dyck. A great deal of work has been done on Van Dyck since the Second World War and work of no less importance is in progress. This has seemed to us, therefore, to be a good moment at which to compile such a Catalogue, building on the foundations laid by [previous commentators and cataloguers]" (Preface [ix]). In high-quality color and black-and-white images (some 800 images in all, over 692 pages), the catalogue includes Van Dyck's special achievement in portraiture, primarily, as well as his work in wholly different genres, such as religious, historical, and allegorical material. Van Dyck was occupied primarily in the service of the political and social elite; his large, dynastic canvases supplied royals, nobles, and courtiers with a standard and a pattern of public presentation. As Jeremy Wood fairly states, Van Dyck was a master of stagecraft and he effectively reinvented royal iconography for seventeenth-century Europe (*Oxford DNB*, 2004).

The two principal challenges which must have daunted even this catalogue's team of established specialists concern (i) the structure and organization of Van Dyck's rather huge output over some twenty active years of commissions in Antwerp, Italy, Brussels, and London (indeed, one learns that Van Dyck's work schedule was fairly punishing and very probably ego-driven); and (ii) the sheer accessibility of the catalogue (its reader-friendliness) to a broad readership of academic specialists, generalists, students, and uninformed newcomers to Van Dyck and the visual arts of the seventeenth century. Both of these serious matters are addressed by the team's skillful arrangement of the catalogue into four discrete sections, an arrangement which provides both a broad chronology of Van Dyck's work in several geographical locations, as well as the artist's movements and career development amongst the rich and powerful of seventeenth-century Europe, each setting not without its own clientele, patronage, artistic tastes, rewards, and tensions. Readers, thus, are tactically navigated through some 700 dense pages of images, dates, facts, and names owing to this sensible partitioning:

Section I, on Van Dyck's early work in Antwerp and initial visit to London (October, 1620 - March, 1621), is assembled by Nora De Poorter, Director of the Rubenianum, Antwerp, and author of monographs on Rubens and Jordaens; Oliver Millar and Susan J. Barnes, referenced below, assisted with information on Van Dyck's first English visit.

Section II, on Van Dyck's work in Italy (1621-July, 1627), is prepared by Susan J. Barnes, independent art historian, co-curator with Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., *et al.*, of *Anthony van Dyck* (Washington, D.C., 1990) and curator of *Van Dyck a Genova* (Genoa, 1997).

Section III, on the mature work of Van Dyck produced in the Netherlands (the second Antwerp period, 1627-March, 1632; Brussels, late 1633/early 1634-mid 1635), is set out by Horst Vey, former Director of the Kunsthalle, Karlsruhe, and author of the standard work on Van Dyck's drawings.

Section IV, on Van Dyck's important work as "principalle Paynter" at the Court of Charles I (London, 1632-1641), is presented by Sir Oliver Millar, Surveyor Emeritus of The Queen's Pictures, organizer of *Van Dyck In England* (exhibition, National

Portrait Gallery, London, 1982-3), and author of several essays and catalogues.

In addition to a Preface, a Note To The Reader, a documented Chronology of the biography and career of Van Dyck (b. Antwerp, 1599 - d. Blackfriars, 1641), as well as an extended Bibliography and Index, the four cataloguers have prepared excellent introductory essays, with endnotes, for each of the four sections; and each of the numbered images throughout the catalogue includes a dedicated commentary on the sitter, the occasion, the probable date of the painting, provenance history, locations of copies and other versions, remarkable *pentimenti*, technique and iconography, and essential published research on the painting. Clearly, the catalogue's coverage and attention to detail invite broad applications for scholars of the visual arts, certainly, as well as for students of seventeenth-century literary culture and patronage, and also devotees of interdisciplinary studies. Unmentioned to date by other reviewers of this catalogue is its value in the art market, particularly with regard to connoisseurship and also authenticating attributions; the timely subject of the role of the *catalogue raisonné* is recently discussed by Michael Findlay and also Peter Kraus in Ronald D. Spencer's important collection, *The Expert versus the Object: Judging Fakes and False Attributions in the Visual Arts* (2004).

The new Van Dyck catalogue is a dazzling achievement in sheer physical assemblage and organization, and it surely will be the standard work for many decades to come for all students of Van Dyck and the visual arts of the seventeenth century.

Recent information on Van Dyck, since the publication of this catalogue in 2004, includes John Peacock's monograph, *The Look of Van Dyck: The Self-Portrait with a Sunflower and the Vision of the Painter* (2006); the purchase from Historical Portraits, London, of Van Dyck's widow portrait of Mary (Villiers), Lady Herbert, later Stuart, Duchess of Richmond (very probably the "Ephelia" poetess), by the Timken Museum of Art (San Diego, CA; see Timken's online newsletter, Spring 2006; see also, "A Royal Van Dyck," Historical Portraits site, Discoveries link); and commentary on the intriguing gloves iconography in Van Dyck's double portrait of Mary Villiers and the dwarf Anne Gibson in the online archive, *Thumbprints of Ephelia* (*ReSoundings*, 2001, updated annually).

Dung-Carters and Holy Avarice in Edward Taylor's "Mediation 1.46"

William J. Scheick
University of Texas at Austin

Nay, may I, Lord, believe it? Shall my Skeg
Be ray'd in thy White Robes? My thatcht old Cribb
(Immortal Purss hung on a mortall Peg,
Wilt thou with fair'st array in heaven rig?
I'm but a jumble of gross Elements
A Snaile Horn where an Evill Spirit tents.

A Dirt ball dresst in milk white Lawn, and deckt
In Tissue tagd with gold, or Ermins flush,
That mocks the Starrs, and sets them in a fret
To se[e] themselves out shone thus. Oh they blush.
Wonders stand gastard here. But yet my Lord,
This is but faint to what thou dost afford.

I'm but a Ball of dirt. Wilt thou adorn
Mee with thy Web wove in thy Loom Divine
The Whitest Web in Glory, that the morn
Nay, that all Angell glory, doth ore shine?
They ware no such. This whitest Lawn most fine
Is onely worn, my Lord, by thee and thine.

This Saye's no flurr of Wit, nor new Coin'd Shape
Of frolick Fancie in a Rampant Brain.
It's juyce Divine bled from the Choicest Grape
That ever Zions Vineyarde did mentain.
Such Mortall bits immortalliz'de shall ware
More glorious robes, than glorious Angells bare.

Their Web is wealthy, wove of Wealthy Silke
Well wrought indeed, its all brancht Taffity.

But this thy Web more white by far than milke
 Spun on thy Wheele twine of thy Deity
 Wove in thy Web, Fulld in thy mill by hand
 Makes them in all their bravery seem tand,

This Web is wrought by best, and noblest Art
 That heaven doth afford of twine most choice
 All brancht, and richly flowerd in every part
 With all the sparkling flowers of Paradise
 To be thy Ware alone, who hast no peere
 And Robes for glorious Saints to thee most deare.

Wilt thou, my Lord, dress my poore wither'd Stump
 In this rich web whose whiteness doth excell
 The Snow, though 'tis most black? And shall my Lump
 Of Clay ware more than e're on Angells fell?
 What shall my bit of Dirt be deckt so fine
 That shall Angelick glory all out shine?

Shall things run thus? Then Lord, my tumberill
 Unload of all its Dung, and make it cleane.
 And load it with thy wealthi'st Grace untill
 Its Wheelles do crack, or Axletree complain.
 I fain would have it cart thy harvest in,
 Before its loosed from its Axlepin.

Then screw my Strings up to thy tune that I
 May load thy Glory with my Songs of praise.
 Make me thy Shalm, thy praise my Songs, whereby
 My mean Shoshannim may thy Michtams raise.
 And when my Clay ball's in thy White robes dresst
 My tune perfume thy praise shall with the best.

Drawn from Revelation 3:5, the epigraph of Edward Taylor's "Meditation 1.46" (1692) anticipates that the white garment of redemption—the robe of flesh Christ donned to save humanity—will serve as the dominant image in

the poem. Much of the imagery in this meditation (Stanford 74-76) is in fact devoted to the varieties, production and decoration of cloth. Less certain, however, is the identity of the narrator who is fixated on this redemptive raiment. It is the poet who speaks, of course, but through what performative persona? Similar to the voices heard in other poems comprising the first series of Taylor's *Preparatory Meditations*, the bumbling narrator in the reverently playful "Meditation 1.46" is effectively a theatrical character who reveals himself to us through dramatic monologue.

Applying an English cultural practice he had observed firsthand both in his homeland and New England, Taylor fashions a speaker whose vocabulary indicates his social rank. A cluster of words in the first stanza suggests the narrator's position at the low end of the seventeenth-century English social scale. This cluster includes "Skeg," "Cribb," "Purss," "rig," "Horn" and probably "Peg." In Taylor's day these words had different meanings depending on their distinctive use within various social strata. Considered singly, each of their specific connotations in the monologue does not reveal much more about the speaker than a certain uncultivated awkwardness in self-expression. Considered collectively, however, the close association of these words in the short span of the monologue's opening lines intimates that the narrator is very familiar with the seventeenth-century argot of English criminals: "Skeg" (theft, plunder), "Cribb" (pilfer, hoax), "Purss" (loot), "rig" (rob, cheat), "Horn" (declared an outlaw), and "Peg" (indicted).

Such a representation of the narrator dramatizes Taylor's Calvinistic belief in the criminal sinfulness of fallen, innately-depraved humanity. Just as in society crime and poverty are commonly found together, in Taylor's Calvinistic understanding humanity is impoverished precisely because of its post-Adamic outlaw relationship with the Creator. Metaphorically representing this dual spiritual condition, the narrator in "Meditation 1.46" is not only familiar with criminal argot but also economically destitute. He is barely surviving at his low-end job as the carter of "Dung." His rickety "tumberill" (a wagon that can be tilted to dump a load) aptly represents his filth-filled body subject to decay and death.

Since the socially and spiritually fallen dung-carter is poor, he has nowhere to live other than inside the foul cart of his mortal body. His body/wagon is "thatcht," a conventional humorous seventeenth-century roofing allusion referring to head hair. The narrator's skin, furthermore, is described as a tarp

stretched over his wagon-load of dung, an image the narrator extends into a comparison of himself to dung-loving snails living inside their shells. When the narrator laments that “an Evill Spirit tents” beneath this fleshly tarp, he refers to the body’s mortality and the fecal stink of decay inside him. Obviously the carter’s situation is far from good as he works with and lives inside this ramshackle “thatcht old Cribb” made of “Skeg” (inferior wood) and featuring a “poore wither’d Stump.” It is no wonder that such a destitute person would fantasize about riches.

Nor is it surprising that the narrator is unable to comprehend why a well-off, peerless lord (Christ) would simply give away something of immense value (“wealthi’st Grace”). He is understandably skeptical about such a free offer. Well versed in the ways of criminals, he wrestles with the suspicion that he is being gulled in some sort of confidence scheme. Confidence is indeed the issue.

The narrator needs to reassure himself about this lord’s generosity (the promise of redemption). He needs to be more certain that what he has heard is “no flurr of Wit,” no deceiving rhetorical sleight of hand. He is equally on guard against any counterfeit, any “new Coin’d Shape,” that might make him a dupe in the transaction. He wants to trust, but he is hesitant: “Nay, may I, Lord, believe it?” This question, which opens the monologue, initiates the dual tone of skepticism and amazement registered throughout the poem.

The possibility of such a rapid transformation in economic and social standing may reflect Taylor’s late-Renaissance awareness of the economic blurring of clearly demarcated social ranks. In spiritual terms, however, the poet also affirms the older hierarchical distinction between rulers and subjects. In crude socio-economic terms the narrator wonders how could he, someone of such low social rank, possibly be chosen for such an astonishing largesse? At the core of his vacillation between belief and doubt is the fundamental question Calvinists were routinely urged to ponder concerning their possible elevation in spiritual standing through divine election.

Of course the impoverished dung-hauler is not going to decline the priceless gift, if it is indeed offered, despite his inability to comprehend the motivation (divine mercy) behind it. In fact, Taylor’s persona in “Meditation 1.46” mimics the sensibility of the criminal exiled to a penal colony in “Meditation 1.15” (Scheick 94). Both have grown greedy through earthly hardship, and both ask for huge quantities of their lord’s bounty. After all, the destitute

dung-carter thinks, since “Well wrought,” “richly flowered,” “Wealthy Silke” or “Lawn” (fine linen) “deckt / In Tissue tagd with gold” is being given away, why not ask for as much of it as can be gotten? He can appreciate Christ’s spiritual garment of redemption only through his delimiting materialistic understanding. And so he mistakenly—humorously, for the savvy reader—tries to quantify Christ’s unquantifiable munificence.

First, the dung-hauler wants his old bodily cart to be unloaded of its putrefaction (morality). Next, his corporeal wagon needs to be cleaned and covered anew with Christ’s white raiment (redeemed flesh). Reverently amusing here is the narrator’s materialistic suggestion that Christ’s largesse will transform his rickety dung-cart into a more upscale wagon. He specifically hopes for a caravan, a covered wheeled vehicle used during the seventeenth century either to inhabit as a home or to convey goods. He imagines how Christ’s precious white raiment would refurbished both the narrator’s bodily wagon and his social/spiritual status. Then his life would be transformed from low-end impoverishment (death and damnation) to high-end enrichment (eternal life).

The last stanza advances his hope a little further. Just as breezes refreshingly pass through a cleansed and refurbished caravan, the Holy Spirit will blessedly course through a redeemed body. At present, in stark contrast, the foul “Snaile Horn” or “old Cribb” of the narrator’s body/wagon is filled with dung and unpleasant sounds (inept meditations likened to intestinal noises). It is a place more suitable for animal than human habitation. Renovated, however, this body/wagon would have an appealing smell and sound. Cleared and refreshed, it would become the Holy Spirit’s wind instrument (“Shalm”) capable of perfumed, glorious songs (meditative verse) of praise for the Creator.

But this wonderful final stage is reserved for the afterlife, and unfortunately the narrator is still very much an indigent creature in the temporal world, where quantity seems to matter. This is particularly apparent in the penultimate stanza. There the speaker envisions his renovated covered wagon overloaded with “wealthist Grace until / Its Wheels do crack, or Axletree complain.” He fantasizes about “cart[ing this] harvest in / Before its loosed from its Axlepin” (fatally breaks down). That the hauler cannot help but think quantitatively of loading up non-material grace, to the point of cracking wooden wheels and their axles, aptly dramatizes the emotional impact of the spiritual deprivation Taylor believes to define post-Adamic humanity.

Also from the poet's Puritan perspective, the carter's irrelevant and ludicrous greed in this matter satirizes humanity's unworthiness as a recipient of Christ's rich redemptive gift, which remains far beyond human understanding. At least, Taylor humorously implies, the narrator is now avaricious about what really matters (redemption). In an Augustinian sense, too, even avarice, one of the seven deadly sins, is ultimately redeemed and elevated by Christ. In the hopeful, reverently comic vision of "Meditation 1.46" both the dung-carter and his avarice potentially undergo an amazing transformation in social/spiritual status.

WORKS CITED

- Scheick, William J. "Renaissance Art and Puritan Heraldry: Edward Taylor's 'Meditation 1.15.'" *Studies in Puritan American Spirituality* 7 (2001): 81-109.
- Stanford, Donald E., ed. *The Poems of Edward Taylor*. New Haven: Yale

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 54, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. Subscriptions: \$20.00 (\$25.00 international) for one year; \$35.00 (\$45.00) for two years; \$50.00 (\$65.00) for three years. Checks or money orders are payable to *Seventeenth-Century News*, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies.

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

◆ *Latin Translation in the Renaissance. The Theory and Practice of Leonardo Bruni, Giannozzo Manetti, Erasmus.* By Paul Botley. Cambridge Classical Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. x + 207 pp. \$70. In this erudite and absorbing book, Paul Botley provides a context for some of the seminal translations from Greek into Latin which were made in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. As his title indicates, the three humanists on whose work he focuses are Leonardo Bruni (*ca.* 1370-1444), Giannozzo Manetti (1396-1459), and Desiderius Erasmus (1466/9-1536). In examining their output, Botley is specifically concerned to document what they thought about the translations made by their predecessors and how their views in this regard influenced the versions which they produced themselves. The general aim of Botley's study is thus to shed light on the compelling question of "the ways Renaissance scholars thought about the transmission of the ancient works" (1).

Leonardo Bruni, Chancellor of Florence (1410/11, 1427-44), was one of the first humanists in the West to achieve fluency in Greek. Born in Arezzo, where he learned Latin, he had gone to the University of Florence in the early 1390's with the intention of studying law. (For some details on Bruni not

mentioned by Botley, I have relied on James Hankins's article in *Encyclopedia of the Renaissance*, ed. Paul F. Grendler, 6 vols. (New York, 1999), 1:301-6.) But he became acquainted with Coluccio Salutati, who suggested that he study Greek with Manuel Chrysoloras, the learned Byzantine diplomat whom Coluccio brought to Florence in 1397. So began Bruni's productive and, at times, controversial career as a Latin translator of Greek classics. One of the first texts he translated was St. Basil's *De studiis secularibus* (1403), which he dedicated to Coluccio, who cited it as persuasive evidence that pagan authors should be studied. Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* also attracted Bruni's attention early; between 1405 and 1412, he translated eight biographies from Plutarch, including the *Life* of Demosthenes, whose *Philippics* (1405-12), *Pro Diopitthe* (1406), and *De corona* (1407) he also put into Latin. Bruni was interested in Demosthenes not just as an orator but also as a statesman who saw the threat which Philip of Macedon posed to Athens's independence, for in the opposition of Philip and Athens, Bruni observed a disturbing likeness to the enmity between Giangaleazzo Visconti (of Milan) and Florence. Plutarch had paired his *Life* of Demosthenes with the biography of Cicero, a text translated into Latin in 1401 by Jacopo Angeli. Bruni, unhappy with Angeli's version, began a translation of his own but, in the course of things, became dissatisfied with Plutarch himself, who, he felt, showed preference to Demosthenes, partly because the literary format of the *Lives* forced him to omit details which favored Cicero. Bruni's critical awareness of Plutarch's limitations led him to produce his own biography, *Cicero novus* (1412-13), which he encouraged readers to compare with Plutarch's *Life* and with the biographies of future writers whose efforts, he hoped, would surpass his own; for Bruni, a new version did not so much supplant a previous source as compete with and enhance it. The critical perspective which Bruni brought to his assessment of Plutarch is also evident in the view he takes of his historical and philosophical sources. Bruni was a distinguished historian in his own right and wrote the celebrated *Historiarum Florentini populi libri xii* (1415-44); thus it is not surprising that he was also keen to supplement ancient Latin historiography from Greek sources. He produced three texts derived from Greek historians: *Commentaria primi belli Punici* (1419), an epitome of Polybius's early books; *Commentarium rerum Graecarum* (1439), taken from Xenophon's *Hellenica*, and *De bello Italico adversus Gothos gesto libri IV* (1441), based on Procopius's account of the Gothic Wars. Bruni's assessment of Procopius as a writer of history was bleak: in a letter to

Giovanni Tortelli (1442), he wrote that he had produced his own *Gothic Wars*, *non ut interpres sed ut genitor et auctor*; Procopius, he claimed, was useful only as a witness to the facts but *Cetera illius sunt spernenda* (cited by Botley, p. 34). Bruni's translations of Aristotle included the *Nicomachean Ethics* (1416) and the *Politics* (1437); he also produced a Latin version of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Economics* (1420). All of these translations "were retranslations of texts available in medieval versions" (41). Bruni castigated the medieval sources as infelicitous and incapable of doing justice to Aristotle, whom he regarded as eloquent. His own translations, whose language was classicizing, failed to impress such scholars as Alfonso, Bishop of Burgos, who, in an essay of 1430, defended the medieval translations and opined that eloquence, whose aim was persuasion, differed from philosophy, whose object was truth. Bruni's justification for his approach to translating appeared in his *De interpretatione recta* (1424-26), "the first treatise on translation produced in western Europe since antiquity" (42).

Copies of most of Bruni's works, including *De interpretatione recta*, found their way into the library of Giannozzo Manetti, Bruni's younger contemporary at Florence, whose exile from that city, first at Rome (1453-55) and then at Naples (1455/6-59), is explained and dated by Botley (64-70). Manetti translated three works by Aristotle in his final years at Naples: the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the *Eudemian Ethics*, and the *Magna Moralia*. None of these was published until 1473, and their influence on the evolution of Aristotelian scholarship was not significant. But the reasons why Manetti produced these translations are worth noting. His *Nicomachean Ethics* was evidently made in answer to Bruni's version; following Bruni, Manetti seems to have regarded the medieval translations of Aristotle as inadequate, but he also thought that Bruni was too free in his translation of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Thus his own version was an attempt to steer a middle course between the *asperitas* of Grosseteste's thirteenth-century translation and Bruni's *nimia licentia* (cited by Botley, p. 80). Although Gregorio Tifernas, whose work Manetti probably knew at Rome, had recently translated the *Magna Moralia* (1454-55) and the *Eudemian Ethics* with which it circulated, Manetti's versions seem to have been occasioned by the interest of his patron at Naples, King Alfonso of Aragon, in moral philosophy. Manetti's translation of the New Testament was "the first Latin version made from Greek since Jerome's day" (85). It was even less known to his contemporaries than his Aristotelian translations, and only two manu-

scripts of it survive: Vatican Library Pal. lat. 45 and Vatican Library Urb. lat. 6. Manetti probably did not contemplate making this translation until his move to Rome, where he had the support of Pope Nicolas V. Botley argues that it is virtually impossible to establish whether or not Manetti's New Testament was influenced by Lorenzo Valla's contemporary *Annotations* on the text. Although Manetti had intended to translate the whole of the Bible, only his Psalter survives from his work on the Old Testament, and this he dedicated to King Alfonso; Vatican Library Pal. lat. 41, the dedication copy which was probably made under Manetti's supervision, also transmits his treatise on Biblical translations, the *Apologeticus*, a work influenced by Bruni's *De interpretatione recta*. Botley provides an edition of Manetti's Preface to his Psalter in an appendix (178-81).

In 1505, Desiderius Erasmus found a copy of Lorenzo Valla's *Annotations* on the New Testament at Park Abbey, just south of Leuven. Erasmus, who published an edition of Valla's *Annotations*, wrote in his preface to that text that Valla was a *homo grammaticus* and that *totum hoc, divinas vertere scripturas, grammatici videlicet partes sunt* (cited by Botley, p. 133). Erasmus's own criticisms of the text of the New Testament as transmitted in the Vulgate focused upon what he took to be its lack of grammatical correctness or *elegantia*, a term made fundamental by Valla in another work, his *De elegantius linguae Latinae* (1471), of which Erasmus published an epitome in 1529. The Vulgate's lack of *elegantia* obscured the meaning of passages which were clear and unambiguous in the original Greek text, thereby giving readers an imperfect sense of the meaning of Scripture. To remedy this, Erasmus edited the Greek text and made his own Latin translation from it. Between 1516 and 1535, his New Testament went through five editions, each of which contained his Greek text and Latin translation, printed alongside one another, and followed by his *Annotations* "discussing or defending both the Greek and the Latin" (115). Although the *Annotations* take the Vulgate as their point of reference, the text of the Vulgate was included only in the fourth edition of 1527, where it stood on the page in a column on the far right next to Erasmus's Latin translation in the middle column and the Greek text on the far left so that readers could compare versions *ipsis oculis*. The emphasis which Erasmus placed on the need to compare translations is also manifest in his *Annotations*, where he shows the reader a whole range of possible renderings for a given word or locution, usually choosing the clearest and the briefest. Thus, while

Erasmus's Latin translation "attempts to communicate what it is like to read the Greek New Testament," his *Annotations* "attempt to show what it is like to translate it" (131). Erasmus's sense of a plurality of versions is reminiscent of Bruni's view of competing translations.

Paul Botley's *Latin Translation in the Renaissance* is a work of positivistic scholarship in which primary and secondary sources, including manuscripts and early printed books, are examined with meticulous care; readers come away with a wealth of detailed information about how Latin translators in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries acquired texts and regarded their Greek, medieval Latin, and contemporary sources. The book also reminds us that the Latin tradition is an unbroken continuum from Antiquity through the Middle Ages to the neo-Latin period. The editors of the Cambridge Classical Studies are to be given credit for recognizing the relevance of Botley's valuable research to their area of publication. (Jennifer Morrish, University of Kentucky)

◆ *Die Meleagris des Basinio Basini*. Einleitung, kritische Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar. By Andreas Berger. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium, 52. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2002. 433 pp. €36. The *Meleagris* is the first major work of the Italian humanist Basinio Basini (1425-57). Written in Ferrara around the years 1447/8, the epic poem retells the ancient myth of the Calydonian boar-hunt, of the love-story between Meleager and the huntress Atalante, and of Meleager's cruel death caused by his mother Althaea. The 2002 edition of Andreas Berger's book (B.), originally published as a Würzburg dissertation in 2000, offers the first printed critical edition of this essentially unknown piece of humanistic epic poetry.

The edition is preceded by an ample introduction (1-50). B. offers a convincing reconstruction of the complicated genesis of Basini's poem, in which he also discusses the poet's socio-cultural background and his relationships with various Italian noblemen (1-21); he then provides the reader with an overview of the structure and the topics of the *Meleagris* (22-24), and a rather short and perfunctory compilation of Basini's Greek and Latin sources and literary models—the poet was one of the first to understand and imitate the works of Greek epic poets, primarily Homer and Apollonius of Rhodes (25-27). Thereafter, judgements on the work in modern secondary literature are presented (27-28). Furthermore, B. gives an accurate survey of the five

extant manuscripts of the *Meleagris* and of the first printed edition of 1794 and illustrates their relationships within a *stemma codicum* (29–43). He demonstrates that the manuscript preserved in the Biblioteca Estense (Codex Estensis Latinus 6) is likely to be the dedicatory copy for Leonello Bruni, the noble addressee of the *Meleagris*. B's own edition of the text is mainly based upon a Vatican manuscript (Vat. Lat. 1676) which was corrected by the author's hand and thus can be regarded as the authorized edition of the text. The introductory section concludes with a bibliography containing B's main sources of primary and secondary literature (44–50).

The major part of the book consists of the accurate edition of the Latin text of the *Meleagris* with a German prose translation and a commentary (53–433). The edition of Basini's epic (58–225) is preceded by a bilingual edition of Sylvanus Germanicus' *argumenta* of the three single books which were added to the text in the Codex Laurentianus (Laur. 33,29), a copy dedicated to Pope Leo X by Sylvanus Germanicus (54–57). In his edition, B. decides not to change the fifteenth-century humanistic orthography (e.g., *lacryma*, *moestus*, *ocia*). Although the editor here departs from the convention of editing neo-Latin texts by adopting the conventions of classical Latin orthography, his decision is reasonable as the orthography of the text is witnessed by the author's corrections of Vat. Lat. 1676, and the humanistic orthography causes no serious problems for the reading and the understanding of the poem. The edition of Sylvanus' and Basini's text is furnished with three critical apparatuses containing (a) the *variae lectiones* of the manuscripts (without orthographical variants), (b) repeated verses and phrases within the *Meleagris*, and (c) parallels from Basini's other literary works which show the 'formulaic' and somehow 'Homeric' character of his poems. The exact translation, if now and then somewhat clumsy and stylistically inadequate, is a necessary and welcome aid to the understanding of Basini's obscure Latin, the sense of which sometimes even the editor (through italics in his translation) honestly admits not to have figured out.

The extended commentary (226–433) comprises nearly half of the book. A typical piece of German neo-Latin scholarship, it mainly deals with the antique epic sources of Basini's poem. It consists of two parts. The main text offers an interpretative paraphrase of the text in question. The author concentrates on the relationship between the *Meleagris* and its epic models, such as Homer, Apollonius of Rhodes, Vergil, and Ovid, seeking out traditional

motifs, structures, and ‘typical scenes’ adapted and reworked in Basini’s poem. In the footnotes, B. deals with the verbal reminiscences between Basini’s text and its epic predecessors as well as with the statements of the secondary literature (primarily the unpublished *Diplomarbeit* of B. Hofer, Vienna 1990). In this case, it would perhaps have been helpful if B. had occasionally transcended the limits of the ancient epic tradition and had additionally tried to place the *Meleagris* into the tradition of the neo-Latin mythological epic represented by poems such as *Vellus Aureum* of Maffeo Vegio (1431), a friend of Basini’s who, like Basini, adopted the structure of the Ovidian version of the myth (as we learn from the edition of Gleis/Köhler, Trier 1998, pp. 27-29). Thus, a comparison of this epic to Basini’s *Meleagris* would certainly have enriched the commentary with insights into more general conceptions of the neo-Latin mythological epic.

In summary, B.’s book offers an accurate edition of Basini’s *Meleagris* which allows the modern reader easy access to an essentially unknown text. Scholars will also profit from the numerous parallels collected in the learned commentary and use B.’s edition as a solid base for further analyses of this most interesting piece of humanist epic writing. (Claudia Schindler, Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen)

◆ *Adages III iv 1 to IV ii 100*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Ed. by John N. Grant, trans. and annotated by Denis L. Drysdall. Collected Works of Erasmus, 35. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 2005. xii + 592 pp. \$150. *Adages IV iii 1 to V ii 51*. By Desiderius Erasmus. Ed. by John N. Grant, trans. and annotated by John N. Grant and Betty I. Knott. Collected Works of Erasmus, 36. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 2006. x + 667 pp. \$150. These two volumes complete the presentation of the translation and commentary to Erasmus’s *Adages*, begun almost twenty-five years ago as part of the Collected Works of Erasmus (CWE). This is, then, a good time to assess the project as a whole.

As William Barker pointed out in the introduction to his book of selections (*The Adages of Erasmus* [Toronto, Buffalo, London 2001]), the publication of the *Adages* was recognized as a major event in its own day. Erasmus did not originate the genre, but he promoted himself as its inventor and in this case, the self-promotion was largely successful. As a tour de force, the *Adages* represent what one single person could accomplish by reading and digesting

almost everything from the classical past. The 1508 version, although related to the earlier *Collectanea*, gained added lustre from its printer, Aldus Manutius, in whose house Erasmus lived while he saw the new collection through the press. Erasmus continued to work on the *Adages*, producing new editions in 1515, 1517-18, 1520, 1523, 1526, 1528, 1533, and 1536, with each version adding new adages and new detail to the previously published ones. The proverb, as Erasmus explains it, is “a saying in popular use, remarkable for some shrewd and novel turn” (section 1), but its contorted exterior hides a clear, meaningful interior that needs to be opened up, not through allegory but through putting the proverb back into its original literary context in antiquity. Proverbs were ideally suited to the commonplace book, in which memorable sayings were collected under stylistic- and content-oriented rubrics, which helps explain the success of Erasmus’s *Adages* within early modern culture.

The volumes devoted to the *Adages* are therefore among the most important ones in the CWE series, but they have not come into print without difficulties. The first volume, with Margaret Mann Phillips as translator and Sir Roger Mynors as annotator, was published in 1982. Mynors was to have both translated and annotated the next three volumes. Only the second appeared in print before his death in 1989, but he had almost finished the third and fourth volumes, which appeared quickly in 1991 and 1992. Mynors had identified most of the references for the remaining adages before his death, and the authors of the last two volumes have also been able to benefit from the publication of the relevant volumes of the Amsterdam critical edition of Erasmus’s works. The fifth volume contains two of Erasmus’s most important essays on power and its abuse (“A dung-beetle hunting an eagle” and “War is a treat for those who have not tried it”), along with a series of 270 adages derived from Homer whose form and selection differ from Erasmus’s usual practice. Almost all the adages in the final volume, in turn, appeared for the first time after 1508.

The aim of these volumes, as their authors put it, “has been to provide an accurate and fluent English version of the original text, with the identification of the many sources upon which Erasmus drew” (vol. 36, p. ix). In this, they have succeeded. In the end a scholar will have to turn to the original text in the Amsterdam edition, but unlike some of Erasmus’s more recondite theological works, the material gathered together here can be appreciated and enjoyed in translation by the expanded audience that the editorial board of the CWE

has had in mind since the beginning of the project. The notes are more than adequate, identifying citations, providing references to the various editions of the *Adages*, and filling out the background to the points being discussed. At this point, the plan is to go back and do volume 30, which would actually be the first in the series devoted to the *Adages*, providing indices and prefatory matter to the collection as a whole. When this volume is added to the six now in print, the price tag for the set will be in the area of \$1,000—hefty, but almost worth it for anyone seriously interested in Erasmus and in how the classical past was filtered through the prism of early modern culture. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Parrhasiana III: “Tocchi da huomini dotti” – Codici e stampati con postille di umanisti*. Atti del III seminario di studi, Roma, 27-28 settembre 2002. Ed. by Giancarlo Abbamonte, Lucia Gualdo Rosa, and Luigi Munzi. *Aion: Annali dell’Università degli Studi di Napoli ‘L’Orientale,’* 27 (2005). Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 2005. 265 pp. The papers published here include all but three of those presented at the third of an irregularly occurring series focused around, but not devoted exclusively to, the work and library of Aulo Giano Parrasio, Calabrian by birth but Neapolitan by adoption, one of the greatest of the humanist commentators on the ancient poets. Unlike many scholars of his day, Parrasio established his textual criticism on the systematic, indeed obsessive, collection and study of codices owned and annotated by the founding fathers of humanism, from Petrarch to Barzizza, from Loschi to Decembrio. His library included manuscripts that once belonged to such illustrious contemporaries as Demetrius Chalcondylas, editions edited or commented on by such accomplished philologists as Calderini and Beroaldo, and theoretical treatises of Valla, Merula, Poliziano, and Pontano, whose margins bear the results of his researches in his unmistakable hand.

The first group of essays illuminate important, little-known aspects of Parrasio’s biography: Maria Rosa Formentin, “Aulo Giano Parrasio alla scuola di Giovanni Mosco”; Lucia Gualdo Rosa, “Un decennio avventuroso nella biografia del Parrasio (1509-1519): alcune precisazioni e qualche interrogativo”; Fabio Vendruscolo, “Dall’ignoto Falconio all’immortal Fausto”; and Luigi Ferreri, “Genesi e trasmissione del *De rebus per epistolam quaesitis* di Aulo Giano Parrasio.” These essays take us from Parrasio’s youthful study of Greek (Formentin) through the oldest redaction of *De rebus per epistolam quaesitis* (Ferreri)

to the turbulent decade which in a certain sense concludes his life of suffering (Gualdo Rosa), during which two boxes of Greek books were stolen from his young assistant, Lucio Falconio, about whom a good deal more is now known thanks to the research of Vendruscolo. The next section illuminates various aspects of Parrasio's activities as a classical philologist and insatiable collector of texts: Angelo Luceri, "‘*Elabora, mi Alde, elabora*.’ Parrasio e la *Editio Aldina* dell’*Appendix Virgiliana* (1517): un inedito ex *Iani Parrhasii testamentò*"; Elia Borza, "Parrasio e Sofocle: analisi e fonti di un codice napoletano autografo"; Vito Lorusso, "Parrasio lettore di Ippocrate? Note autografe al *Presbeutikòs logos* nel manoscritto Neap. gr. II. F. 30"; Marianne Pade, "Le glosse nel cod. V. G. 14 della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli e il Plutarco di Pier Candido Decembrio"; Giuseppe Ramires, "Parrasio lettore dell’*Appendix Virgiliana* nell’incunabolo Neap. V. A. 36"; Mario Lauletta, "Parrasio e l’*Achilleide* di Stazio"; Antonella Prenner, "Il Claudiano del Parrasio tra il 1482 e il 1500"; and Fabio Stok, "Parrasio e l’*Appendix Probi*." The remaining three essays are not occupied directly with Parrasio but were inspired by questions that concerned him. In "Scritture di glossa dilettori eruditi: un approccio paleografico," Paolo Radiciotti offers a panoramic overview of gloss-writing from late antiquity to the modern era which extends beyond paleography alone, while Paola Casciano, in "Francesco da Brescia apologeta del Valla in uno zibaldone colocciano (ms. Vat. lat. 7192, ff. 77r-79v)," describes the climate of rivalry and polemic in which the heirs of Valla lived and worked. Marc Deramaix concentrates on Gerolamo Seripando, whose library contains many books that had once belonged to Parrasio; "*Spes illae magnae. Girolamo Seripando lecteur et juge de l’Historia viginti saeculorum* de Gilles de Viterbe" demonstrates the importance of Seripando's notes for the history of the papacy at the time of the Council of Trent.

Like *Parrhasiana I* and *II*, this volume is nicely produced, containing helpful illustrations and indices of proper names and manuscripts. The essays it contains are indispensable for anyone working on Parrasio and will be useful as well to anyone working more generally in the field of Italian Renaissance humanism. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *La biblioteca del Cardinal Pietro Bembo*. By Massimo Danzi. *Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance*, 394. Geneva: Droz, 2005. 470 pp. This book is based on the unique surviving inventory of the library that Cardinal Bembo

collected and used during his stay in Rome, as prepared by the French jurist Jean Matal in 1545. The inventory, now part of Additional 565 of the University Library at Cambridge, had disappeared for centuries but was rediscovered in 1993. Danzi's goal is simple and straightforward: to illustrate the book culture of Bembo and to reconstruct the intellectual relationships that depart from his books. In that, he has succeeded admirably.

In preparing the inventory, Matal produced a document that is exceptionally rich and precise, which is important: what can be recovered about these books and the relationships they represent is directly proportional to the accuracy and detail with which the original document was produced. The heart of Danzi's book is therefore the inventory itself—or I should say rather the inventory divided into brief sections, which are accompanied by extensive commentary. When possible, Danzi identifies the manuscript or printed book, giving the location and shelf mark for its present location. This part of Danzi's project proved unusually difficult, in that unlike his father and many of his contemporaries, Bembo did not enter an 'ex libris' or other possession note into his books, forcing Danzi to examine volumes that for some reason might have been Bembo's for some sign that confirms his ownership. He also provides explanatory comments about the material, aimed at an educated reader but one who is not a specialist on the author in question, which highlight important aspects of the text, how this text connects to the works that Bembo himself wrote, at what point in his life it was important to him, and so forth. In this way the inventory and Danzi's commentary on it are drawn into a close relationship to Bembo's epistles, each of them illuminating the other. The nature of Danzi's commentary, as he himself admits, is more impressionistic than systematic, in that he comments on whatever in the inventory entry or text itself strikes him as important, but this seems to me to be preferable to trying to fit the comments to each entry into some predetermined scheme.

The inventory proper is preceded by an introduction of more than a hundred pages, which follows three basic themes. In the first section, Danzi makes connections between Bembo's book collecting and his artistic holdings, showing that for Bembo and his age, artistic-antiquarian collecting and forming a library express two sides of the same coin. The second section, briefer than the other two, provides basic information about Matal and the manuscript that contains the inventory. The third, more extensive section is

composed of an analysis of the inventory that illustrates the nature and tenor of the texts inserted into the Cinquecento debates in which they participated. Two interesting things emerge here: first, Bembo's library shows a focus on Spain and its culture that was often underappreciated in the generations after his death; and second, Bembo had an interest in Hebrew which is certainly not unique, but is unusual even for a churchman of his day. It was one thing to have followed the cabbalistic-Christian line of thinking that led to Ficino and Neoplatonism, but it was quite another to have devoted significant attention to rabbinical commentaries. As P. Kibre pointed out many years ago ("The Intellectual Interests Reflected in Libraries of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 7,3 (1946): 259), "the mere possession of a work does not mean that its owner has read or assimilated its contents," but the Hebrew books in Bembo's library are noteworthy no matter what.

One of the side benefits of the discovery of the Cambridge inventory is the opportunity to separate the books that were in Bembo's library from the other books he owned, principally those acquired during his time in Padua. These other books are examined in an appendix. Danzi's book also contains several indexes that greatly facilitate its use: of printers, other owners of the books in Bembo's library, manuscripts, names, and illustrations. There is a generous selection of twenty-eight illustrations, reproduced on glossy paper to facilitate their legibility. In other words, in detail as well as in broad scope, this is an excellent book, able to take its place beside such classics as Pierre de Nolhac's *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini. Contribution à l'histoire des collections d'Italie et à l'étude de la Renaissance* (Paris 1887) as an example of what we can learn about a Renaissance humanist by paying close attention to the books he owned and read. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae, Pars VIII: 1595*. Ed. by Jeanine De Landtsheer. Brussels: Koninklijke Vlaamse academie van België voor wetenschappen en schone kunsten, 2004. 660 pp. Both the most important representatives of humanism in the Low Countries, Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam (1469-1536) and Justus Lipsius of Overijse (1547-1606), share one particular characteristic: they maintained a large correspondence with humanists and important persons all over contemporary Europe. Another shared characteristic is that they both edited parts of their letters themselves. In the first half of the twentieth century P. S. Allen published his magnificent edition of Erasmus's

letters in what may be considered one of the first monuments of neo-Latin scholarship. Lipsius had to wait longer. Interest in Erasmus often grew from theological issues: after all, he was a central figure in the period that witnessed the rise of the Lutheran Reformation. Lipsius was primarily a scholar of antiquity, although he dominated the intellectual scene of his day in almost the same way as Erasmus. Only with the slow emergence of neo-Latin studies as an independent scholarly discipline in the second half of the twentieth century did Lipsius receive the attention he actually deserved. In 1968, A. Gerlo and H. D. L. Vervliet published an inventory of all known letters by or to Lipsius. That was the start of the modern critical edition of this vast correspondence in the series *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae*, or, in shortened form, *ILE*. The centre of this edition, supported by the Royal Academy of Sciences in Belgium (nowadays by the Flemish branch of this institution), soon moved to Lipsius's own venerable university, Leuven. Rightfully so, as Leuven always had cherished Lipsius as one of its icons (for a long period even more than Erasmus): a large statue in the Bondgenotenlaan and a prominent place for Lipsius among the statues decorating the Gothic town hall prove the significance Lipsius had for the image Leuven cultivated of its own past. Furthermore, it was at Leuven that Jozef IJsewijn developed neo-Latin studies as a scholarly field of its own, by giving it its essential instruments. It is, then, not to be wondered at that one of IJsewijn's former students, Jeanine De Landtsheer, became responsible for several volumes of *ILE*. The object of this review, vol. 8 of *ILE*, is the first one to be published in English, the earlier volumes having been issued in Dutch. If, from a national Belgian viewpoint, it is easy to understand why the language of publication first was Dutch, the change to English attests to the growing interest in Lipsius on an international level. For clearness' sake: this linguistic debate only regards the language of the introductions and notes, as the text of the letters themselves always is given—as it should be in a scholarly edition—in the original, either Latin, Flemish, or French. As Lipsius still has to gain popularity outside of the scholarly world, the moment for a full translation has not yet come.

Volume 8 of *ILE* contains the correspondence for 1595. That year was dominated by Lipsius's manoeuvre to enhance his salary in Leuven, using an invitation to come to Bologna as a sort of threat. Another topic which regularly appears in the correspondence of this year is formed by the two works Lipsius published in 1595, viz. *De militia Romana* and *Poliorvetica*. An

intriguing incident occurred at the end of June, when Lipsius went to Spa for a cure and barely escaped being kidnapped by a group of Dutch riders (*LE VIII* 95 07 04).

The system followed in this well-edited book is as simple as it is obvious: a short introduction gives a summary of the letter's contents and discusses items of identification, date, and transmission. A short list of available sources precedes the proper edition, which is well furnished with notes. For the transmission a distinction is made between Lipsius's autographs, sometimes in various versions, manuscript copies of the original, and printed texts, sometimes also in various editions. The variety of sources, reflected in the critical apparatus, makes this a truly critical edition: sometimes this seems just an academic slogan nowadays, as everyone presents his edition as a critical one, even if it is only a diplomatic edition. A critical edition necessarily relies on various textual witnesses, as is often the case in Lipsius's letters.

As rather many letters are taken up with Lipsius's diplomatic attempts, reading a whole series of them sometimes presents a *déjà vu* effect. This specifically holds true for the letters accompanying copies of *De militia Romana* with the repeated request to defend Lipsius's interests at court. On the other hand, life often is quite repetitive, and Lipsius's concerns and worries appear the more clearly. These letters to influential persons show a marked stylistic difference with the letters Lipsius wrote to his inner circle. If in the latter he often imitates the asymmetric and sententious style of Seneca and Tacitus, his favourite authors, which makes them sometimes rather difficult to read, the letters to officials are far more classical in tone.

Apart from some minor inconsistencies in the introductions and notes, there is one point of limited relevance I would like to mention: in the entire volume the term 'Netherlands' is used to designate the present-day countries of the Netherlands and Belgium. That corresponds to usage in Dutch ('de Nederlanden,' whereas the kingdom of the Netherlands alone is called 'Nederland'), but in English the term 'Low Countries' seems to be more appropriate.

The present volume is a worthy product of the Leuven school of neo-Latin scholars. It is to be hoped that in the future the necessary means will be found to continue this project, which is of the utmost importance to a varied scholarly approach to this period, in Leuven, in the Low Countries as a whole, and even in Europe in general. It is also to be hoped that the same scholarly

level can be maintained, in this and in other related projects. (Michiel Verweij, Department of Manuscripts, Royal Library of Belgium, Brussels)

◆ *Horatius Aquisgranensis. Aachen im Spiegel des neulateinischen Dichters Johann Gerhard Joseph von Asten (1765-1831)*. By Hermann Krüssel. Noctes Neolatinae, Neo-Latin Texts and Studies, 3. Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2004. 847 pp. + illustrations. €128. Herrmann Krüssel's (K.'s) book *Horatius Aquisgranensis* is mainly a translated and annotated edition of the Latin poems by Johann Gerhard Joseph von Asten (v.A.), 1765 to 1831, who lived in Aix-la-Chapelle as an administrative clerk and wrote occasional poetry in German and Latin. The poems, most of them commissioned (549), are displayed in chronological order of composition against the background of the vicissitudes of the history of Aix-la-Chapelle during v.A.'s lifetime. They are counted in roman numerals: 32 individual poems as no. II-XXXIII, a series of elegiac couplets written for prize-distributions at the local school as no. I, and 10 chronograms as no. XXXIV, a-k. Most of poems II-XXXIII praise high-ranking persons on special occasions; the others (I, IV, V, VIII, XV, XVII, XXV) deal with topics of either local or religious (that is, catholic) interest or both, such as the *Aachener Heiligthumsfahrt* in 1790 (V) or the *Basilica Mariana* (XV). Among the honoured dignitaries are German priests and teachers of the period when Aix-la-Chapelle was an imperial town and various French prefects during the Napoleonic era. Three poems celebrate Napoleon Bonaparte himself (XIII: 1802, XIV: 1803, XVI: 1804), and a fourth one is on the birth of his son (XXIV: 1811). The poems are written in various metres: apart from the prevailing elegiac couplets and hexameters, we also find alcaics (X, XIII, XVI, XIX, XXI, XXVII), the sapphic (XIV), and the second asclepadeic strophe (XXIII).

K.'s book has nine chapters. Chapter I (11-12) informs the reader about the circumstances under which K. has detected two autographs of poems by v.A. Chapter II (13-47) summarizes the historical background: Aix-la-Chapelle was an imperial town until the army of the French revolution conquered it in 1792, French until Napoleon's defeat at Leipzig, and Prussian from then onwards. Chapter III gives an account of v.A.'s life (48-68) and identifies possible sources for his Latin poetry (69-80) with a particular reference to the classical and neo-Latin authors that were read at the Jesuit school he attended as a boy and to poetical handbooks such as the *Theatrum lyricum* by Panthal

Eschenbrender, S.J. (Frankfurt 1768). Some remarks on local historiography follow (81-83). Chapter IV deals with the textual history of v.A.'s Latin poems, which survive in two autographs, now kept in Cologne, Historisches Archiv des Erzbistums, 'Nachlaß von Asten' (84-92) and Aix-la-Chapelle (Aachen), Öffentliche Stadtbibliothek [Br 275] (93-101). Some of the poems were also printed on the occasion they celebrate (102-110). The chapter ends with a short reference to printers in Aix-la-Chapelle (111-12). Chapter V (113-669) contains the text of the poems in chronological order, furnished with an introduction to each poem providing information on the occasion for which it has been written, a critical apparatus, a second apparatus of parallel places from ancient Latin authors, a commentary, and a metrical translation into German. In Chapter VI (670-81) some specimens of v.A.'s German poetry are given. Chapter VII (682-706), entitled "Eine Würdigung von Astens," is a (positive) assessment of v.A. as a Latin poet in general and as an imitator of Horace in particular. In this context a metrical analysis of v.A.'s poems is given. Chapter VIII presents a selection of other Latin poems written by other authors (e.g., Heinrich Brewer, Laurentinus Maria Danner, Jakob Lambert Cuvelier, Johann Maria Nikolaus DuMont, Wollradus Scholl, Emericus De Quadt, Johann Peter Joseph Beissel, and Peter Conrads) in or about Aix-la-Chapelle and some inscriptions from that area (707-98). Chapter IX contains the documentary and bibliographical references as well as an appendix with further illustrations (801-47).

Whether every single Latin verse that emerges from some archive needs to be published or not, is a general methodological question in the field of neo-Latin studies which I do not have to decide here. If this question is answered affirmatively, K.'s book has the merit of bringing a hitherto-unknown neo-Latin author to light and of presenting his writings in their historical context. But this is all that can be said in its favour.

A major defect of the book lies in its pointlessness. A huge mass of material is spread out in front of the reader, but any sense of adequacy and disposition is missing. The explanations lack as much in specific observations as in original thoughts. The only idea maintained throughout the whole book is K.'s positive attitude towards v.A. as a poet which culminates in an appraisal (!) in chapter VII. It should be said at this point that no one but K. himself confers on v.A. the honorary title "Horatius" (12; 688-91). By doing so, however, K. does not show the slightest awareness that there are other neo-

Latin poets who have been called thus, either by their contemporaries or by their modern interpreters. K. generally seems to be little interested in the current state of neo-Latin studies, as he does not refer to even the most obviously relevant titles.¹ With regard to the presentation and documentation of the text, one finds the main function of the *apparatus criticus* to lie in documenting the different use of minuscules and majuscules in the two autographs.² The line-by-line commentary presents itself as an awkward mixture of basic grammatical and factual explanations on the one hand and meaningless interpretation of single figures of speech on the other.³ Nowhere in the commentary does one come across a serious argument that might lead to some conclusion of broader interest.

The most annoying of the book's shortcomings, however, is K.'s deficient command of his native language. His diction is clumsy beyond scholarly standards. The first *lapsus* appears already in the subtitle: the idiomatic phrase "im Spiegel von" is normally combined with an abstract expression, not with a person's name. As it stands the metaphorical meaning of "Spiegel" gets lost and one understands v.A. to be the owner of a real mirror. It should be "Aachen im Spiegel der Dichtung des J. G. J. von Asten." Idiomatic mistakes of this kind are not a minor problem of the book, but, in combination with grammatical faults, its most characteristic feature, making it a pain to read and understand for native speakers of German; what others will make out of it, I do not dare to imagine. In K.'s metrical translations of v.A.'s poems, violations of grammar, word order, and stresses are too frequent and too strong to be excused by the poetic register of speech, and some forced, would-be-original modernisms cannot make up for them.⁴ It cannot be denied, though, that K.'s adaptations do have a certain entertaining value when read aloud in company.

The typography can simply be called a disaster: the pages have hardly any margin. Far too many different fonds⁵ and frames⁶ are used. As a rule (not followed strictly in chapter II, however) Latin is printed in bold and German in italics,⁷ so that we read the main text and footnotes in italics. The line spacing of the main text is a lot wider than usual, which explains the number of the book's pages (847!). One wonders how a renowned publishing house can have accepted so amorphous a manuscript and printed it without checking the typographic form.

This book is a failure, perhaps not so much of its author, who probably did his best, as of those who were involved in its production and did not prevent it. It disgraces the series in which it has been published. (Ruth Monreal, Universität Tübingen)

Notes

1. To name just a few: G. B. Pighi, "Orazio nella poesia latina moderna," *Publicazioni dell'Università Cattolica des S. Cruore* 4.22 (1936): 131- 146; E. Schäfer, *Deutscher Horaz: Conrad Celtis–Georg Fabricius–Paul Melissus–Jacob Balde. Die Nachwirkung des Horaz in der neulateinischen Dichtung Deutschlands* (Wiesbaden 1976); *Enciclopedia oraziana*, vol. III (1998); D. K. Money, *The English Horace: Anthony Alsop and the Tradition of British Latin Verse* (Oxford 1998).

2. E.g.: "114 Aquis] B: aquis 115 Reges] B: reges 118 Imperii] B: imperii] 119 Reges] B: reges 122 Dux Isabella] B: DUX ISABELLA" (382).

3. E.g., *ad carm* XX, 3-4: "Et precor, ut melior semper lux ista recurat / et precor ut pulsus det bona plura malis": "pulsis...malis] Das Hyperbaton bildet eindrucksvoll das Entschwinden am Horizont ab, doch ist der ablativus absolutus auf die künftigen Zeiten als Vorbedingung für bessere Zeiten zu beziehen. Vorerst lässt die unruhige Situation in Europa noch keinen Frieden zu, auch nicht in Wien; in V. 8 wird der Friede als Wunsch herbeigesehnt" (460).

4. E.g., "Historiae veterum praesens in imagine tempus / Ostendo placent & recreando docent. – Da sie im Bilde die Gegenwart zeigt, gefällt die Geschichte / von den Alten, sie lehrt auf die erquickende Art" (131).

5. Two different fonds to start with on p. 3; a third is used on p. 4; a fourth on p. 23; a fifth on p. 679; a sixth on p. 762, not to mention the constant variation among bold, italics, and capitals.

6. Examples for various types of framing can be found on p. 23, p. 45, p. 564, p. 581, and p. 634.

7. K claims to apply the typographical principles of the *Monumenta Germaniae historica* (113).

◆ *Tous vos gens a latin: le latin, langue savante, langue mondaine (XIV^e – XVII^e siècles)*. Ed. by Emmanuel Bury. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 405. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2005. 463 pp. The papers in this volume originated in a conference held in October, 2000 at the Ecole Normale Supérieure, on the theme "Langue du savoir – langue des savoirs." The idea was to stimulate inquiry on Latin as being both the learned language par excellence, unique in its genre, and a test of new knowledge, ranging from the medieval invention of

an ontological vocabulary to the inventory of the previously inconceivable realities of the 'new' world. Notwithstanding the fact that belles lettres tends to dominate the work of neo-Latinists today, Latin retained preeminence in the diffusion of scientific ideas through the eighteenth century: Newton, for example, owned more books in Latin than in English, and he annotated his Latin books in Latin. The fact that mathematics has replaced Latin today as the scientific language par excellence might suggest that the latter is incapable of expressing the new realities perceived during the scientific revolution, but the situation is more complicated than this: Boyle, for example, received the initial inspiration for his corpuscular theory from the most Latinate philosopher of his day, Gassendi, who created the term itself in Latin.

In "Réflexions médiévales sur les langues de savoir," Pascale Bourgain provides the medieval background for the problems being considered here, highlighting the sacred stature of Latin and its special place as a stable literary language. As Anne Grondeux shows in "Le latin et les autres langues au Moyen Âge: contacts avec des locuteurs étrangers, bilinguisme, interprétation et traduction (800-1200)," knowledge of Latin complemented knowledge of one or two vernaculars during the Middle Ages, becoming a sort of 'metalanguage' that allowed analysis of the vernacular. In the case of German, as Claire Lecointre shows in "L'appropriation du latin, langue du savoir et savoir sur la langue," grammatical categories taken from Latin led to a reconceptualization in the sixteenth century of the way that the vernacular worked. The famous debate in 1435 between Flavio Biondo and Leonardo Bruni turned as well on bilingualism, in that the debate was over whether one language, classical Latin, could be used for both learned discourse and popular speech. This issues spilled over into the production of encyclopedias, as we see in "Encyclopédies en latin et encyclopédies en langue vulgaire (XIII^e-XVIII^e siècle)," where Jean-Marc Mandosio demonstrates that the vernacular was viewed as a proper medium only for information in the practical, artisanal spheres. Pierre Lardet examines the grammatical principles that underlay Latin in "Langues de savoir et savoirs de la langue: la refondation du latin dans le *De causis linguae latinae* de Jules-César Scaliger (1540)." Linacre sought a balance between usage, which Valla had championed in his *Elegantiae linguae latinae*, and systematization, the heritage of the medieval logical grammarians; Scaliger went further in attempting to anchor grammatical *ratio* in philosophical *ratio*. Martine Furno examines dictionary-makers in "De l'érudit au

pédagogue: prosopographie des auteurs de dictionnaires latins, XVI^e-XVIII^e siècles,” suggesting that around the beginning of the seventeenth century, this work passed from learned lexicographers to educators. As Monique Bouquet shows in “Le *De viris illustribus* de Lhomond: un monument de frantin,” by the eighteenth century Latin had become an artificial language; by this point the language of reference was the vernacular, with the structure of Latin being comprehensible as a series of deviations from it. In “Changement d’objectif et/ou changement de méthode dans l’apprentissage du latin au XVII^e siècle? *La Nouvelle Méthode* [...] *latine* de Port-Royal,” Bernard Colombat follows a series of changes in successive editions of an important work of Claude Lancelot, showing how closely grammatical theory was tied to pedagogical exigencies. The figure of the pedant and his use of learned language engage Jocelyn Royé in “La littérature comique et la critique du latin au XVII^e siècle,” closing out the first group of papers, which were devoted to knowledge about language and the role of Latin in relation to that knowledge.

Another group of papers focuses more on usage and transformation. As the title of his paper suggests, Michel Lemoine considers neologisms in Calcidius’s commentary to the *Timaeus* in “Les néologismes dans le commentaire de Calcidius sur le *Timée*,” while Joëlle Ducos traces the impact of the rediscovery of Aristotle’s treatise on meteorology on new scientific concepts and the words to express them in “Passions de l’air, impressions ou météores: l’élaboration médiévale d’un lexique scientifique de la météorologie.” Jacques Paviot turns his attention to the language of naval construction in “Le latin comme langue technique: l’exemple des termes concernant la navire,” while Marie-Joëlle Louison-Lassablière shows how Latin came to the aid of Italian to develop a technical language for dance in “Antonius Arena ou le latin macaronique au service du savoir chorégraphique.” In “Le latin, langue de la philosophie dans les traités d’amour du XVI^e siècle en Italie. Les enjeux du *De Pulchro et Amore* d’Agostino Nifo,” Laurence Boulègue demonstrates that when Nifo chose Latin instead of Italian to deal with love, the frame of reference shifted from Petrarch to Aristotle, especially the *Nicomachean Ethics*, providing a corporal dimension that is absent from Neoplatonic treatments of the subject. Finally, as we see in “Langue ancienne et nouveau Monde,” thanks to Geneviève Demerson, the ‘discovery’ of the ‘new’ world forced Latin to adapt itself to things unimagined in antiquity—an adaptation that was carried out quite successfully.

The final group of papers examines individual neo-Latin writers. Alexandre Vanautgaerden begins by studying the Latin letters of Erasmus's printer, Froben, in "L'oeuvre latin' de Jean Froben, imprimeur d'Erasmus," while Jean-François Cottier focuses on Erasmus's *Paraphrases* as a project of vulgarization in "Les Paraphrases sur les Evangiles d'Erasmus: le latin, instrument de vulgarisation des écritures?" In "Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (1490-1573), traducteur du grec et historiographe en langue latine: sur le choix de l'écriture en langue latine en Espagne vers 1540," Dominique de Courcelles shows that for Sepúlveda, imitation of the Latin historians is the appropriate way to celebrate the Spanish monarchy on a Europe-wide stage. In "La Dissection des parties du corps humain et son double: les anatomies latine et française de Charles Estienne (Paris, 1545-1546)," Hélène Cazes suggests that for Charles Estienne, Latin and French complement one another, with two versions of the same treatise being used to bring together the science involved and the terms with which it is described. Etienne Wolff in turn explores the complexity with which an author can choose Latin to maximize his potential audience, yet present himself as an eclectic anti-Ciceronian opposed to neologisms in "Jérôme Cardan (1501-1576) et le latin." There are three papers devoted to the seventeenth century: that of Ludvine Goupillaud, "*Demonstrationem mirabilem sane detexi: mathématiques et merveille dans l'oeuvre de Pierre de Fermat*," which explores the Latinity of an important mathematician; that of Jacob Schmutz, "Le latin est-il philosophiquement malade? Le projet de réforme du *Leptotatos* de Juan Caramuel Lobkowitz (1681)," focused on a project of Latin grammar reform; and that of Yasmin Haskell, "Bad taste in baroque Latin? Father Strozzi's Poem on Chocolate," which presents and analyzes an interesting poem on chocolate. Alain Michel provides a final synthesis in "Le latin, les mots et les choses: Virgile, Eckhart, Edmond Jabès," suggesting that it is Latin that unifies the various strands of western culture, from philosophy to science and poetry.

The papers in this volume attest to the vitality of Latin, from the Middle Ages to the modern period, as an object of study, as a basis for linguistic theory, and as a pedagogical tool, offering a common language to discuss new ideas in both belles lettres and the sciences. There is much here to interest any reader of this journal. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Friendship and Poetry: Studies in Danish Neo-Latin Literature*. By Minna Skafte Jensen; ed. by Marianne Pade, Karen Skovgaard-Petersen, and Peter Zeeberg. University of Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 2004. 273 pp. \$50. This book contains thirteen studies in Danish Neo-Latin literature, written by Minna Skafte Jensen. The articles, all previously published, have been collected here under the appealing title “Friendship and Poetry.” About half of them were originally written in Danish and have been translated into English for the purpose of this volume. In three cases, articles were published originally in “international languages” other than English (German, Italian), and these have not been translated. The subtitle is “Studies in Danish Neo-Latin Literature”; it might as well have been “Poetry,” as far as the content of the book is concerned, but one understands why it was necessary to avoid using the word “poetry” twice in the title.

To neo-Latinists, Skafte Jensen is best known as the editor of the important survey *A History of Nordic Neo-Latin Literature* (Odense 1995); she has been, and still is, a leading and influential neo-Latin scholar in Scandinavia and has just been elected president of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Let us leave aside here the other main field of scholarship that is cultivated by the emerita professor of classical philology in Odense, Denmark: Homer and the Homeric question.

The leading thread of the book is readings of poems—in particular, Danish Neo-Latin poems, written in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The author has her own way of pointing out the key aspects of each poem; it seems simple, which of course it is not, since it presupposes—among other things—intimate knowledge of ancient poetry as well as of the contemporary Danish society and history. These skills are used, for example, to point out the model that has been imitated and to reveal play on mythology and etymology. Skafte Jensen also has an open eye for metre, disposition, and poetical language; an example of the latter is found in the article on the epitaph of the nobleman Jørgen Rosenkrantz: “And the anaphora in line 7 of *ipse* for the Saviour and *ipsum* for the resurrected T suggests a meeting of two parties that are to a certain degree equal: as Christ is both man and God, *Hominemque Deumque*, the deceased will be able to see him with his human but no longer mortal eyes” (103). Another example is the treatment of Hans Sadolin’s use of the linguistic parallel between the names of Catullus and his own critic Pigellus (72).

Skaftte Jensen has picked out poems that are particularly interesting and of high quality. One does not find in her book analyses of, e.g., students' poems on the occasion of their professor's birthday, and the poems analysed do not at all reflect the bulk of neo-Latin poems. Apparently, the reason is not that Skaftte Jensen is uninterested in the sociological aspects of Latin poetry-writing in the period—on the contrary: among the aspects treated in the volume are the connections to career and friendship (cf. the title of the book)—but that she prefers to read and present readings of poetry that is at least of middling quality, if not excellent. The intellectual challenge for the scholar working with great poetry is unique in each case and there is no general recipe, but I think Skaftte Jensen reveals part of her method when she writes on p. 24: “A cursory glance down the poem reveals its focus on form...” It is a pleasure to read the results.

Even if readings of individual poems are never completely absent, Skaftte Jensen also presents surveys, as, for example, in the article entitled “Latin Bucolic Poetry in Sixteenth-Century Denmark,” first published in the *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Guelpherbytani*, ed. S. P. Revard, F. Rädle, and M. A. Di Cesare (Binghamton, 1988), where she is able to present a survey that is amusing and rich on perspectives at the same time about a genre that was fairly short-lived in Denmark. This was a pioneering work: “Neo-Latin pastoral in Denmark has not, to my knowledge, been described in international handbooks, except for a few pages in Grant 1965” (note on p. 27). But the reader wants references to works that have appeared *after* Skaftte Jensen's article, if there are any. And if not, this information might have been given, too. One may ask: Have the footnotes been revised for the present volume, and to what degree? Another example is found in note 2 on p. 18, where the reference has the form of a recommendation to the reader: “On Sadolin's youthful poetry, see Friis-Jensen and Skaftte Jensen 1984, 394-96.” Since the work in question is written in Danish, the reference might have been given in a form that appreciated the fact that this work will be unavailable to most readers. While we are treating the availability of the book to international readers, one thinks that a couple of matters concerning Danish history would have deserved explanatory notes, as, for example, when one reads about the reopening of the university of Copenhagen (28).

One may question the practice of translating small quoted passages into English when the whole poem has been translated. One example is “*fateor furoris* (I confess, wrath),” which is quoted on p. 24 as an example of alliteration. The two Latin words have no syntactical connection, the context being “*Est tibi iusti fateor furoris/Causa*” (“I must admit that Thou hast cause for just wrath”). In this case, the translation of *fateor* has also been altered. Among the very few misprints that I have found is the erroneous spelling of Walter Ludwig’s name in a note on p. 45.

But these are mere details, and there is no doubt that the book can be recommended for everyone interested in neo-Latin poetry—students and scholars alike. The editors, Marianne Pade, Karen Skovgaard-Petersen, and Peter Zeeberg, are all former students of the author. Had they lived in the sixteenth or the seventeenth century, they would surely have chosen neo-Latin poetry as their form. As it is, the result of their efforts as editors is a beautiful, modern way of thanking a beloved teacher and of expressing their friendship. (Vibeke Roggen, University of Oslo)

◆ *Companion to the History of the Neo-Latin Studies in Hungary*. Ed. by István Bartók. Budapest: Universitas Publishing House, 2005. 138 pp. *Camoenae Hungaricae*. Ed. by Gabriel Kecskeméti. Vol. 1, 2004, 146 pp.; Vol. 2, 2005, 155 pp.; Vol. 3, 2006, 180 pp. Budapest: Institute for Literary Studies of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. As many readers of *Neo-Latin News* know, the most recent congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies took place in Budapest this past summer. For those of us who attended the congress, there are many good memories—I think this meeting will stick in my mind as the one at which we never stopped eating—but there was food for the mind as well as the body. The organizers took care to provide tangible evidence throughout the meeting of the breadth and strength of neo-Latin studies in Hungary. The volumes under review here were distributed gratis to the participants at the congress, but are also available through the publishers listed above.

Worth its proverbial weight in gold is the *Companion to the History of Neo-Latin Studies in Hungary*. The book does exactly what its title suggests, providing an orientation to the historical development of Neo-Latin studies in Hungary. Each section gets out the facts, as it were, but does so within an interpretive framework that helps a non-Hungarian reader understand why the names

and works she is being introduced to matter. Barnabás Guitman, for example, titles his treatment of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries “Res Publica Christiana – Res Publica Litteraria,” discussing first the beginnings of humanism in Hungary, then the accomplishments of neo-Latin philology in the sixteenth century. In “Latin Texts in the Service of Churches and Schools,” István Bartók explores the way in which educational and religious needs drove the production of neo-Latin literature in the seventeenth century, through the publication of original Latin texts, the insertion of Latin sources into comprehensive works, and the writing of translations, revisions, and so forth. Éva Knapp and Gábor Tüskés see the eighteenth century as providing “Fore-runners of Neo-Latin Philology and National History of Literature,” discussing in turn textual publication, genres, and translations. László Takács then uses the figure of the handmaiden to structure his discussion of the nineteenth century under the title “Ex ancilla domina”: philology began this period as the handmaiden of history and ended it as mistress of the humanities. The first half of the twentieth century, as Farkas Gábor Kiss explains, was devoted to the “Separation of Classical and Neo-Latin Philology,” with József Huszti being in many ways a pivotal figure. The final period is surveyed by László Havas in “From Separate Local Workshops to Unified National Framework – Becoming Part of International Institutions,” with a systematic survey of universities, institutes, libraries, and archives; of periodicals; of studies on Hungarian neo-Latin literature outside Hungary; and of writings in Latin in the twentieth century. The importance of the second part of the book, in turn, is somewhat belied by its title: “Little Encyclopedia of Neo-Latin Philologists.” This section may contain only thirty pages, but it is an important thirty pages whose information is not easily obtainable elsewhere in any of the western languages. The indices of personal and place names facilitate the use of the book, which closes with a two-page glossary that gives place-name equivalents in the various central European languages. This is more useful than one might think: while at the congress, I purchased an eighteenth-century edition of Virgil whose place of publication was listed, in Latin, of course, as “Tymaviae.” The city was in Hungary at that point, where it was called “Nagyszombat”; it is now in Slovakia, where it is called “Trnava.” A kind gentleman from Trnava who happened to be at the congress explained all this to me, but in the absence of such resources, the glossary can save one hours of work.

As László Szörényi, chairman of the editorial board, explains in the introduction to the first issue, *Camoenae Hungaricae* was planned from the outset with an eye on the 2006 IANLS congress, as a forum to present Hungarian neo-Latin philology. Vol. 1, 2004, offers the following articles: László Havas, “La naissance de la littérature hongroise en latin (Entre la civilisation byzantine et la culture latine occidentale)”; Ágnes Ritoók-Szalay, “Das gemeinsame Europa der Humanisten”; László Szörényi, “*Omnia Calliope concentu temperet und Panegirico e poema in Giano Pannonio*”; Péter Kulcsár, “I manoscritti di Antonio Bonfini”; István Bartók, “*Grammatica Hungarolatina—Grammatica Latinogermanica János Sylvester und Marcus Crodelius*”; Gábor Kecskeméti, “*Genus iudiciale* in the Practice and Theory of Hungarian Literature in the 16th and 17th Century”; Piroska Balogh, “*Horatius noster. Der Horaz-Vortrag von Ludwig von Schedius aus 1794-1795.*” Vol. 2, 2005 contains: Zsuzsanna Kiséry, “*Qui amant ipsi sibi somnia fingunt* (Virg. *Ecl.* VIII, 108) – Francesco, l’inaffidabile narratore del *Secretum*”; Klára Pajorin, “La cultura di János Vitéz”; Olga Peria, “*Res privatae* dans la correspondance de Iohannes Vitéz de Sredna et Janus Pannonius”; László Török, “Janus (poeta) festivus”; László Jankovits, “Il carattere virgiliano dei panegirici di Giano Pannonio”; Darko Novakovič, “Le traduzioni dal greco di Janus Pannonius: la filologia al servizio della politica”; Concetta Bianca, “Come avvalersi dei nemici: Giano Pannonio e Plutarco”; István Dávid Lázár, “La traduzione latina dedicata a Mattia Corvino del *Trattato* del Filarete”; Gilbert Tournoy, “Il primo viaggio intorno al mondo di Magellano nella relazione di Massimiliano Transilvano”; Gábor Kecskeméti, “Hungarian Connections of Nicodemus Frischlin”; Elisabeth Klecker, “Maria Theresia und Aeneas: Vergilrezeption zur Bewältigung der weiblichen Erbfolge”; and László Havas, “Ricerche sulla letteratura mediolatina e neolatina in Ungheria nella seconda metà del secolo XX e alle soglie del nuovo millennio: Dai centri di ricerche ai programmi nazionali e alle collaborazioni in progetti internazionali.” In Vol. 3, 2006, we find the following articles: István Dávid Lázár, “La «docta ignorantia» del Petrarca”; Klára Pajorin, “Antiturchica negli anni quaranta del ‘400: Le epistole di Francesco Filelfo, di Poggio Bracciolini e di János Vitéz”; Enikő Békés, “La metafora «medicus - Medici» nel *De doctrina promiscua* di Galeotto Marzio”; István Bartók, “‘Grammatica est ...’: The Significance and Sources of János Sylvester’s Definition”; Pál Ács, “Andreas Dudith’s Turkish Brother-in-Law”; Gábor Kecskeméti, “A Hardly-known 16th-century Humanist: Paulus Rosa of Körmöcbánya”; István Bitskey, “Historie und Politik

(Gedichtband von Leonhardus Uncius über die ungarische Geschichte)”; Emil Hargittay, “Péter Pázmány: *De ecclesiastica libertate circa causam Veneti interdicti* (1606)”; Sándor Bene, “*Acta pacis*—Peace with the Muslims (Luigi Ferdinando Marsili’s Plan for the Publication of the Documents of the Karlowitz Peace Treaty)”; László Havas, “La tradizione testuale degli *Ammonimenti* di Santo Stefano di Ungheria e il *Tractatus de potestate* del principe Ferenc Rákóczi II”; László Szörényi, “Dugonics’ *Argonautica*”; and Réka Lengyel, “La fortuna ungherese del *Libro di Fortuna* del Petrarca (Le edizione ungherese del *De remediis utriusque fortunæ* nel secolo 18).” Book reviews, and announcements of conferences and research projects, fill out each volume.

The journal and the *Companion* do their job well, attesting to the vigor of neo-Latin studies in Hungary. Given that Latin was the official language for government work in Hungary until 1844, this is not surprising, but it is good to be reminded in such tangible ways as these. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Silva: Estudios de humanismo y tradición clásica*. Ed. by Jesús M.^a Nieto Ibáñez and Juan Francisco Domínguez Domínguez. Vol. 4, 2005. León: Universidad de León, 2005. 421 pp. This, the fourth volume of the new Spanish annual devoted to neo-Latin studies, contains nine articles. In “Mercator and the *Theatrum Mundi*: The Map as Cosmographic Text and the Humanistic Community in the 16th Century,” Lauren Beck focuses on Gerard Mercator as a focal point for sixteenth-century humanistic activity in the areas of map-making and cosmography. Mercator’s scholarly world stretched from Spain to England, with traces of these relationships to be found both in his own maps and writings but also in the work of the cartographers he influenced. In “Notas críticas a la edición del *Itinerarium ad regiones sub æquinoctiali plaga constitutas Alexandri Geraldini*,” the goals of Carmen González Vázquez are more modest: to offer brief commentary on fifteen passages of a work that merits a new critical edition, to accompany the Spanish translation which has been prepared by the author of this article and is currently in press. Raúl Manchón Gómez, in “*Telemachi, Ulyssis filii, peregrinationes*: una desconocida versión poética neolatina del Telémaco de Fénelon en la España del siglo XVIII,” offers an introduction to a neo-Latin translation of Fénelon’s *Télémaque*, published in Madrid at the end of the eighteenth century, and places this almost-unknown version into a broader discussion of Latin translations of Fénelon’s bestseller,

which reminds us that translation regularly went from the vernacular into Latin in the early modern period as well as the other way around. Next, in “Una versión poco conocida del tema de Filomela en la literatura española del siglo XVII: la *Filomela* de Antonio López de Vega (1620),” Antonio María Martín Rodríguez studies the only post-classical Spanish treatment of the Procne and Philomela myth that has not received a modern critical study. Martín Rodríguez provides an edition of the text, then an analysis that reveals López de Vega to be a perfectly competent poet, fully capable of interweaving his source material from Ovid and Hyginus with passages of his own invention. The author of “«Aquí fue Troia nobles cavalleros»: Ecos de la tradición clásica y otros intertextos en la *Historia de la Nueva Mexico* de Gaspar Pérez de Villagrà,” is Martín Rodríguez’s brother Manuel, who has established a notable reputation as a specialist in U.S. Chicano literature. Here Manuel M. Martín Rodríguez turns his attention to a little-known work of Mexican literature, examining it through the filter of modern literary theory, so that contemporary work on representation and discourse analysis, for example, sheds interesting light on a text that turns out to be a fascinating blend of notarial documentation, pre-Hispanic elements, and classical references. In “*Tristia rerum*. El poeta neolatino Hernán Ruiz de Villegas y su testamento,” Valentín Moreno Gallego offers a brief look at the life and works of this neo-Latin poet, concluding with the publication for the first time of Ruiz de Villegas’s will. Aurelio Pérez Jiménez’s “Plutarco en Alciato, I” studies the relationship between the emblems of Alciato in the 1534 edition and the works of Plutarch, especially the *Moralia* and *Vitae*, with an eye on the *Commentaries* on Alciato’s *Emblems* by Minoes and El Brocense as well as Juan de Valencia’s *Scholía*. In “Góngora: presencia y ocultación de los clásicos,” Ignacio Rodríguez Alfageme examines the classical motifs and mythological allusions in selected works of Góngora from the perspectives of genre and academic background. Finally, Lara Vilà’s “Batallas más que pictóricas. Écfrasis e imperialismo en *El Monserrate* de Cristóbal de Virués” studies the relationship between Virués’s poem and the western epic tradition, especially Virgil’s *Aeneid*. In this unusually interesting article, Vilà begins from the premise that Renaissance epic poets took from Virgil the idea that the genre serves a symbolic image of political power that emphasizes its universal, hereditary, and eternal nature. This image is bound closely to the *ecphrasis*, with Spanish depictions of the Battle of Lepanto, for example, rewriting Virgil’s description of Aeneas’s

shield and the Battle of Actium. The volume closes with almost seventy double-columned pages of reviews, followed by a detailed *index nominum*.

The articles in this volume exemplify the best in Spanish philological scholarship, giving evidence of why *Silva* has established itself rapidly as one of the leading outlets for current scholarship in neo-Latin studies. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *‘Et scholae et vitae’*. Acta selecta van twee colloquia van Orbis Neolatinus (Leuven, 1998-2002). Ed. by Dirk Sacré and Marcus de Schepper. Amersfoort: Florivallis, 2004. The use of neo-Latin texts in secondary education is by no means a common practice. As neo-Latin texts do not always follow very closely the standard rules of classical Latin syntax, draw much of their vocabulary from all registers and periods of Latinity, and very often aim at coining quite an individual and surprising style, they are often considered to be of no great value for teaching. Moreover, one seems to be under the impression that pupils do not take great interest in their strong religious slant or the very specialised subject.

When the Belgian neo-Latin society *Orbis Neolatinus* organised a first *Colloquium Didacticum* in Leuven (Belgium) in 1998, it is very likely that the organising committee intended to counter just these sorts of prejudicial considerations of neo-Latin. In 2002 a second colloquium took place, and finally in 2004 some of the lectures which were presented at the first gathering and all of the ones from the second were published under the title *‘Et scholae et vitae’*. The book is also provided with an index and a few illustrations. The title, which playfully reminds the reader of the Senecan *non scholae, sed vitae discimus* (Sen., *Epist. ad Lucil.* 106.12, stated the other way around, but with disapproval) clearly emphasises the element *schola*, and not only as a witty pun. Already at the beginning it becomes very clear that the book aims to stress the great use and value of neo-Latin texts for secondary classes. Indeed, all Latin passages have a smooth (Dutch) translation and do not pose any great problems as far as grammar or vocabulary are concerned. Moreover, every one of them offers an enticing and most of all useful chapter from the rich treasury of neo-Latin literature.

As it is, Petrarca’s animated story of his ascent of Mont Ventoux (11-22) or De Thou’s witty epigrams on the noisy church bells of Paris (115-34) are topical subjects for Latin classes. Contributions such as the one about Gemma

Frisius's cartographical experiments (89-96) or Ferdinand Verbiest's mechanics (185-94) are fine opportunities to set up an interdisciplinary project in a school. And, for those students who want to challenge their skills or take a peek at what Latin studies at the university level might look like, the book offers a few heftier papers (such as the one about a rediscovered letter of Philip Rubens or about a *scholion* of Kant's which counters Leibniz's thinking). Only a few times, at least in my opinion, does a contributor overestimate the pupils' abilities—e.g., when one author offers a specially reviewed fragment for thirteen-year-olds from Morus' *Utopia* (74) which has sentences like *Margaritas legunt in litoribus et in rupibus quibusdam adamantes: neque tamen quaerunt, sed oblatos casu perpoliunt* (cf. Morus: *Margaritas praeterea legunt in litoribus, quin in rupibus quibusdam adamantes ac pyropos quoque; neque tamen quaerunt, sed oblatos casu, perpoliunt.*) Never mind the grammar and vocabulary aid the author offers, this is much too difficult for the target audience.

Generally speaking, the book was safeguarded from typing errors. However, as certain mistakes threaten good comprehension, I should mention the following: “inwonertaal” (25, lege: “inwonersaantal”), *quanti momenti* (35, lege: *quanti momenti*), *esse profectio* (35, lege: *esset profectio*), *pontifixe* (42, lege: *pontefixe*), *proemium* (46, lege: *prooemium*), *Archivium* (62, lege: *Archivum*), and *Bargas* (93, lege: *Bergas*).

However, all in all *Et scholae et vitae* is a fine book and a very good opportunity for teachers and pupils alike to broaden their horizons. For that matter, the contributions are never too long, so that a small *excursus* such as one from this book will never threaten a teacher's organisation of the curriculum. On the contrary, everyone welcomes a change once in a while, and this book is undoubtedly just what is needed to do this. (Tom Deneire, Catholic University of Leuven)