



EVENTEENTH-



ENTURY



NEWS

FALL - WINTER 2020

Vol. 78

Nos. 3&4

Including

THE NEO-LATIN NEWS Vol. 68, Nos. 3&4

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

VOLUME 78, Nos. 3&4

FALL-WINTER, 2020

An official organ of the Milton Society of America and of the Milton Section of the Modern Language Association, **SCN** is published as a double issue two times each year with the support of the English Department at Texas A&M University.

SUBMISSIONS: As a scholarly review journal, **SCN** publishes only commissioned reviews. As a service to the scholarly community, **SCN** also publishes news items. A current style sheet, previous volumes' Tables of Contents, and other information all may be obtained via at www.english.tamu.edu/scn/. 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: d-dickson@tamu.edu
scn.sites.tamu.edu
and
oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/94990

ISSN 0037-3028

SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY NEWS

EDITOR

DONALD R. DICKSON
Texas A&M University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Livia Stoenescu, Texas A&M University
Michele Marrapodi, University of Palermo
Patricia Garcia, University of Texas
E. Joe Johnson, Clayton State University

NEO-LATIN NEWS

CRAIG KALLENDORF, EDITOR
Texas A&M University

WEBMASTER

Megan N. Pearson, Texas A&M University

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Kaitlyn Tipton, Texas A&M University

CONTENTS

VOLUME 78, NOS. 3&4..... FALL-WINTER, 2020

REVIEWS

- Damiano Acciarino, ed., *Paradigms of Renaissance Grotesques*.
Review by LIVIA STOENESCU..... 95
- Stephen Rose, *Musical Authorship from Schütz to Bach*.
Review by TIM CARTER..... 102
- The Complete Works of John Milton. Volume XI: Manuscript Writings*.
William Poole, ed. Review by P.G. STANWOOD 107
- Brendan Prawdzik, *Theatrical Milton: Politics and Poetics of the Staged Body*.
Review by ANTHONY WELCH 111
- J. Caitlin Finlayson & Amrita Sen, eds., *Civic Performance: Pageantry and Entertainments in Early Modern England*.
Review by J. P. CONLAN 116
- Chanita Goodblatt, *Jewish and Christian Voices in English Reformation Drama: Enacting Family and Monarchy*.
Review by DARRYL TIPPENS 126
- Caspar Barlaeus, *The Wise Merchant*. Ed. with intro. by Anna-Luna Post. Tr. with notes by Corinna Vermeulen.
Review by MICHAEL J. REDMOND 132
- Erik R. Seeman, *Speaking with the Dead in Early America*.
Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK..... 135
- Thomas Keymer, *Poetics of the Pillory: English Literature and Seditious Libel, 1660–1820*. Review by NIALL ALLSOPP..... 137
- Brent S. Sirota and Allan I. Macinnes, eds., *The Hanoverian Succession in Great Britain and its Empire*.
Review by CHRISTOPHER N. FRITSCH..... 142
- Todd Butler, *Literature and Political Intellection in Early Stuart England*.
Review by BRETT A. HUDSON..... 149
- Thomas M. Lennon, *Sacrifice and Self-Interest in Seventeenth-Century France: Quietism, Jansenism, and Cartesianism*.
Review by ELISSA CUTTER..... 154
- Chloé Hogg, *Absolutist Attachments: Emotion, Media, and Absolutism in Seventeenth-Century France*. Review by IVY DYCKMAN 158
- NEO-LATIN NEWS..... 161

Damiano Acciarino, ed. *Paradigms of Renaissance Grotesques*. Toronto: Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2019. 597 pp. + 153 illus. \$49.95. Review by LIVIA STOENESCU, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY.

The literature on ornament yielded significant results with Alina Payne's books *The Architectural Treatise in the Italian Renaissance: Architectural Invention, Ornament, and Literary Culture* (1999), *From Ornament to Object: Genealogies of Architectural Modernism* (2012), and *Histories of Ornament: From Global to Local* (2016). Notable contributions also came from, but were not limited to, Alessandra Zamperini's *Ornament and the Grotesque—Fantastical Decoration from Antiquity to Art Nouveau* (2008), Frances S. Connelly's *The Grotesque in Western Art and Culture* (2012), Clare L. Guest's *The Understanding of Ornament in the Italian Renaissance* (2015) and Damiano Acciarino's own *Lettere sulle grottesche (1580–1581)* (2018). Alexander Nagel put the ideas about ornament in devotional context in *The Controversy of Renaissance Art* (2011), in which discussions of ornament are correlated to Italian Renaissance initiatives to replace images with marble ornament at Vicenza Cathedral and other Italian monuments in the wake of the Reformation. The edited collection of Damiano Acciarino brings new insights into the debates over the role of the ornament in the ecclesiastical cultures of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, in the particular case of *grottesche* (grotesques) that drew critical attention when iconoclasm clashed with the emerging grotesque art of the Renaissance (30). Even though the Protestant polemics against images did not castigate the grotesques as deceitful images, the rhetoric of Andreas Karlstadt gave the Catholics stern warnings about the danger of hidden and arcane meanings inherited from classical sources. The critique of the Protestant Reformation eventually succeeded to turn the grotesques over to the censorial eye of the Counter-Reformation. Cardinal Gabrielle Paleotti's *Discourse on Sacred and Profane Images* (1582) focused on the matter of decorum, urging the Roman Church that the grotesques be excluded from the liturgy and removed from the sacred art because they were profane and idolatrous (41). These ideas form the substance of the introductory chapter by Damiano Acciarino, who sets the tone for some stimulating discussions.

The volume is broken down into Part I, Theoretical perspectives; Part II, Practical applications; and an appendix comprising of the letters of Ullise Aldrovandi, Pirro Ligorio, Giambattista Bombelli, Egnazio Danti, Federico Pendasio, and Alfonso Chacón. Several chapters, however, digress from the goals and ambitions highlighted by Acciarino and instead offer interesting research about the development of ornament in Italian Renaissance art in a post-Reformation age. The undisputable value of this edited collection lies in the chapters that engage with the relevance of ornament to the underestimated concerns over whether the figurative and non-figurative grotesques transgressed the Catholic dogma. These chapters indeed mark exceptional steps forward in challenging our perceptions that Roman Catholicism feared only the figurative visual language of the Renaissance culture that gravitated around the anthropologically-charged image. Alternative forms of hybrid or non-figurative art, to which the grotesques belonged, were equally targeted as the arched enemy of the Counter-Reformation.

In Part I, Alessandra Zamperini's *Grotesque and the Antique. Raphael's Discovery of the Fourth Style* underscores the interests in the Neronian grotesques, first used by Pinturicchio's funerary monuments in Rome's Santa Maria del Popolo and Ara Coeli, and brought to the stage of creative intervention by Raphael in his undertaking to recreate the Domus Aurea grotesques as faithfully as possible. Dorothea Scholl's "*Sense of Nonsense*" *A Theology of Grotesque* stands out for a thorough examination of a "theology of grotesques" in the context of the Counter-Reformation's fraught associations with the Renaissance and Reformation. The Christian humanist culture of the Italian Renaissance embraced the teachings of Marsilio Ficino that Orpheus was the theological instructor and harbinger of a divine order of creation, hence inspiring grotesque decorations to help "antiquate" Christianity in Renaissance humanism (89). Scholl has argued that "in this perspective, grotesques are not merely decorative frames or elements suitable for embellishing empty spaces; they are intimately linked to "poetic theology" and express theological insights (91) while being remarkably exemplified, among others, by Luca Signorelli's depiction of Empedocles's vision of the universe as a reflection on the theology of grotesques (92).

The waning of Christian humanism coincided with the rise of the Counter-Reformation's authoritative positions against the corruption of Christian thought with paganism. Cardinal Paleotti took particular interest in gathering an array of sources on the grotesques by the foremost specialists of his time, including Ulisse Aldovrandi, Pirro Ligorio, and Giambattista Bombelli. His purpose was to document and then dismiss the conceptions of grotesque art as expressions of demonic and heretical ideas, which having existed only in the artists' imagination injure the Catholic dogma. With remarkable erudition, Philippe Morel's *Laughing with the Grotesques in the Renaissance* examines the lapsing of the grotesques into the categories of carnivalesque, macaronic, parody, folly, and paradox. Such derogatory characterizations yielded intricate and alternative meanings, which exposed the relative merits of the grotesques even more arcane than they were commonly accepted to be. Clare L. Guest's *Plato's Stag Goats: Sophistic Heritage in Renaissance Grotesques* elaborates on the role of the grotesques in the cultural tension between illusion, idealism, and mimesis (174). Efforts to salvage the grotesques from accusations of triviality and falsehood diverged into interpreting their symbolic character as expressions of symbolic theology. Maria Fabricius Hansen's *Telling Time: Representations of Ruins in Grotesques* investigates the temporality of grotesques as a paradigm for the transformation from the stage of form to that of formless in the case of ruins. Hansen remarkably intertwines her observations about the treatment of ruins and dilapidated architecture with Renaissance painting and ornament which similarly devolved from form to formless due to the intervention of time: "Therefore, what is at stake in representations of ruins seems to be at stake on a more general level in grotesques intended as a compositional device: the visualization of passages between a form and the formless, or between culture and nature, with change and movement as key concepts. In this sense, the frequent prospects with ruins are in perfect alignment with the conditions of image-making governing grotesques in general" (205). We learn more about the aesthetics of the grotesques in Simon Godart's *Grotesque Poetics: Michel de Montaigne's Use of Grotesques in De l'Amitié (I: 28)*. Writing and painting share an affinity to grotesques by means of intertextual recombination: the painter combines heterogeneous elements to create unnatural life forms; the writer, in turn,

transplants to his own text borrowings from monstrous transformation (227). Montaigne's *De l'Amitié* adapts Horace's *ut pictura poesis* to reconstruct intertextual combinations of language and style that mirror the properties of grotesque painting in writing. Drawing the matter of the grotesque on the associative meanings of the arabesque, which became the modern term used to describe the figured ornament known as *grottesche* in the Renaissance, Frances S. Connelly's *Unwinding the Arabesque: Grotesque Ornament and Modern Meaning* illustrates the fascination with grotesque expressions as an enduring feature of art over the centuries. The modern age expanded on Horace's *ut pictura poesis* so as to include ornament and reach beyond the focus on literal texts and images. Disagreement between Winckelmann's theory of an ideal beauty far removed from the grotesque expression and the modern artists' preoccupation with full assimilation of ornament into their works led to a parting of the ways (249). The modernists called the ornaments "arabesques" and recognized them as conveyors of a new symbolism inspired by non-Western geographical territories. The painters Paul Gauguin and Philipp Otto Runge alongside the poet and cultural critic Charles Baudelaire, writer John Ruskin, and philosopher Friedrich Schlegel argued for a reconciliation of figurative and ornamental expressions that placed a premium on the arabesque as the server of argument.

In Part II, Kathryn Blair Moore's *The Logic of Grotesques in Renaissance Art: Marian Figuration at the Limits of Representation* focuses on Pinturicchio's frescoes in Rome's Santa Maria del Popolo where the grotesques helped embody the devotional meaning of Mary's presence in the decoration of the chapels of Giovanni di Montemirabile and Domenico Della Rovere. Pope Sixtus IV (1471–84) heralded a Golden Age of devotional renewal under the auspices of Mary (268); the pope's ambitions must have inspired artists such as Pinturicchio to use the transformative and illusionistic character of grotesques from the frescoes of the Domus Aurea to describe the regeneration in the earthly realm. The regenerative significance of the grotesques was thought, in a culture of reform, suitable for representing the state of miraculous metamorphosis and Incarnation associated with the mystical sense of Mary's body.

A more careful editing job would have been necessary to avoid repetition in Part II and to make several chapters cohesive reading. Luke Morgan's "*Nocturnal Fowl Disoriented by Sunlight*": *Grottesche and Gardens in the Late Sixteenth Century* takes us back to discussions of the Counter-Reformation critique of *grottesche* from Part I, but concludes with a new subtopic: *mescolanza*, a defining feature of the hybridity of *grottesche*, in architecture and gardens. We learn from Veronica M. White's *Ridicolosa Rassomiglianza: The Art of Exaggeration in the Carracci's Caricatures* that Carracci's caricatures took on a different approach to Leonardo da Vinci's studies of grotesque heads as exaggerated and abnormal forms (474). In Annibale's and Agostino Carracci's work and in the drawing practice they taught at the Carracci Academy, the effects of vividness and humor were based on the observation of the live model so as to discourage the portrayal of a mere imaginative monstrous physiognomy, which was considered to be detrimental to the religious meaning of art advocated by Cardinal Paleotti's *Discourse* (1582).

The volume concludes with an appendix broken into three sections, each containing letters by famous counter-reformatory humanists who replied to Cardinal Paleotti's reluctance to admit the grotesques to devotional art. The letters are newly published sources in English translation, aiming to elucidate the controversial nature of the grotesque in a sixteenth-century culture dominated by a solid admiration of classical antiquity and simultaneous mistrust for the residual paganism of classical sources in the arts. In Ulisse Aldovrandi's *Five Letters on Painting* (translated by Thomas DePasquale), the grottos, as the space in which the grotesques were painted, are "the remains of the Golden House of Nero, which, as Suetonius testifies, was of such great size that it occupied both the Palatine and Caelian hills, extending to the Esquiline, reaching all the way to the Gardens of Maecenas so that it resembled a large city" (506). For Aldovrandi, the grotesques are the errors of painters who put their imagination above the imitation of nature: "painters delighted in making many paintings according to their imagination and whim, which in nature are not found, just like the grotesques of our modern painters" (513). Culling from Plato and Aristophanes, Aldovrandi goes on to dismiss the grotesques as having "no correspondence to actual things" and

thus different from the imperfections of nature which “sometimes produces monsters because she is impeded from achieving her end, for she has no intention of producing monsters” (523). The next corpus of letters in the appendix is Pirro Ligorio’s *Three Letters on Grotesque Painting* (translated by John Garton). Pirro Ligorio (1512–1583), a humanist with a deep passion for Roman antiquities and an architect, painter, and antiquarian, maintains that the aesthetic irregularity of the grotesques is the antithesis to the harmony of the classical order. Ligorio mentions Vitruvius to substantiate his argument against the grotesques: “Vitruvius did not praise them in [his treatise on] Architecture, calling them things of weak composition like dreams, like deformities with respect to the majestic, strong, beautiful composition that architecture brings together” (536); and “Whence, not without cause Vitruvius does not admit them among the stable and most eternal things of orderly buildings, but places them with vain things and among things weak and unstable and related to the vain desires, among things hazy and irrational,” (537). Ligorio’s definition of the grottos is sweeping and includes the Christian catacombs: “Now then, the grottos, take many forms and go by many different names, they are likely to be called caves, crypts, caverns (*spelei*), or cryptoporticos and catacombs, in whichever fashion, all were painted with grotesque things, dedicated to the Sun and to the Moon, to Hecate or to Persephone. But the grottos of San Sebastiano and those of San Lorenzo, those on the Via Appia and on the Tiburtina, are sepulchers that served in part nobles and in part Christians and our early martyred saints,” (539). Ligorio seems to express serious doubt about the reassignment of the Christian catacombs from spaces displaying pagan pictures to places for Christian worship: “... one sees in the parts used by gentiles some paintings, and the parts that were used by Christians are white and without pictures, and in some places, one sees the older encrustation from the pagans, above the non-painted layer” (557). An anticipated counterpoint to Ligorio came from the no-less-learned humanist Giambattista Bombelli, whose *Three Letters on Grotesques* (translated by Sylvia Gaspari) are included next in the appendix. Bombelli echoes the sixteenth-century ideas about melding classical antiquity and Christian humanism in order to bend the zeal of Ligorio; he states: “... I do not know upon what Signor Ligorio

bases his understanding in this last discourse in writing to describe, as he does, the particular places of these crypts ...” (566) and “So that it seems to me that either Signor Ligorio has misunderstood or he knows more than Vitruvius” (566). Bombelli endorses the surreal meaning of the grotesques as the invention of the artists’ imagination and admires them for their recognized role in decorating ancient and contemporary houses: “... their grotesques, which in themselves have no order or specific end, and are just that abused license of the painters of which Flacco spoke in his Poetics ... it seems to me superfluous to go on, as they are clearly the dreams and phantasmas of painters, painted in every part of ancient houses as decorations and embellishments, as is in use even today” (568).

Camillo Paleotti (1520–1594) was in close contact with the literati of his time who decided to send him their works: Ulisse Aldrovandi, Francesco Barozzi (who dedicated his *Rythmomachia* in 1572), Bartolomeo Ugolino Pacini (who chose him as recipient of the *De iuris scientiae laudibus* in 1574), and Count Giuliantonio Ercolani (who in his treatise on calligraphy of 1571, dedicated to Gabriele Paleotti, uses the name of Camillo among the examples of application of *cancelleresca* writing). The relationship between Camillo Paleotti and the intellectuals then active in Bologna, or linked to it in various ways, is codified in the *Tumulus* (Bologna, G. Rossi, 1597), a collection of poetic compositions in his honor compiled, a few years after his death, by Giulio Segni and addressed to Cardinal Cinzio Aldobrandini. In Acciarino’s appendix, Egnazio Danti’s (1536–1586) *Letter to Camillo Paleotti* (translated by Sylvia Gaspari), the effort was to clarify aspects of the interrelatedness of Christian practice and pagan ritual in the case of the Roman catacombs. Danti, an Italian mathematician, geographer and brother of the sculptor Vincenzo Danti, believed that the moderns gave the name grotesque to a certain sort of painting “because Vitruvius does not call them by this term” (570). In sync with the popularity of decorum in the Counter-Reformation, Danti attached the outlandish appearance of the grotesques to the improper function of the space: “I believe that they made such paintings rarely and of little importance and of monstrous things, since these grottos were monstrous themselves and were made use for the dissolution that took place in those baths” (570). The appendix concludes with

the letters of Federico Pendasio (1525–1603) to Giovanni Francesco Arrivabene (b. 1515) and of Alfonso Chacón (1530–1599) to Camillo Paleotti, both translated by Sylvia Gaspari. A Spanish Dominican scholar in Rome and Greco-Roman classicist, Chacón relates the grotesques to the exotic art brought by the military campaigns of the Roman empire: "... when [the Romans] returned victorious from various ventures on land and sea, they also liked to paint their residences with fantastical animals and monsters that were found in the conquered countries, that in Rome were new ... and enticed by the desire of this variety, the painters began (with their freedom and that of the poets) to add falsity to the truth, painting various fantasies, such as men with serpents for arms and other limbs, and fantastical acts" (574).

Enhanced by impeccable illustrations and abounding in intriguing research, *Paradigms of Renaissance Grotesques* is a noteworthy contribution to the study of Renaissance culture in the aftermath of the Reformation. Though inevitably part of a particular intellectual configuration, this edited collection owes more to Italian Renaissance experts than to the heterogenous group who studied the grotesques, for instance, in Renaissance Spain. Yet the goals, ambitions, and standards so eloquently outlined in this edited collection will unquestionably spur other scholars on to develop the topic of *grotesche*.

Stephen Rose. *Musical Authorship from Schütz to Bach*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. xvi + 243 pp. + 14 b/w illus. with 2 tables and 12 music examples. \$99.99. Review by TIM CARTER, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL.

Who is the "author" of a musical work? It will seem an odd question for those accustomed to listening to "Beethoven's" Fifth Symphony or "Verdi's" *La traviata*, although anyone following Roland Barthes' notion of the "death of the author" (or Foucault's nuancing of it) will be aware of its undertones. As so often happens, music is also a special case given that for the most part it lives and dies in the moment of performance. So one might better modify the question: What constitutes a musical work? Or perhaps better: What work is

required to produce something that might or might not come to be called a musical work?

Stephen Rose focuses on a period when these issues came to a head in particularly intriguing ways. He is concerned with the efforts of “German” Kapellmeisters from Heinrich Schütz (1585–1672) to Johann Sebastian Bach (1685–1750) to establish their position as music-makers in artistic rather than artisanal terms—an issue that will be familiar to art historians, although Rose hardly pursues the comparison—and as the creators of something more than just singular musical events involving the performance forces under their charge. They did so by way of changing concepts of creativity (the subject of Rose’s Chapter 1); by inserting themselves within—but distinguishing themselves from—emerging notions of a musical canon (Chapters 2–3); by adopting various strategies to claim ownership of their work(s) (Chapter 4); by seeking to steer the course of artistic fashion (Chapter 5); and by asserting some manner of control over performers whose own musical egos might otherwise hold sway (Chapter 6). Inevitably, Rose’s arguments turn on the developing nature of the musical marketplace in German-speaking lands. And no less inevitably, the issues tend to hinge on so-called print culture and its various strengths, weaknesses, threats, and opportunities in particular, but not only, so far as music was concerned.

Rose is on familiar ground here given his prior distinguished work in the field, and he navigates it with great aplomb. He is particularly strong on how composers sought to control the market for their wares by way of printing and publishing. He is concerned less with the musical content of their editions than with their so-called paratexts: elaborate title pages, engraved portraits of the “author,” dedications and encomia, and the like. He also discusses how composers and their printers sought to assure consumers of the authority and authenticity of these editions—even down to Schütz’s use of paper with a monogrammed watermark—and to protect their profits by way of privileges. Like many of us, however, he falls at the hurdle of the economics of printing, given how little information seems to survive in the archives. In 1598, Johann Steuerlein claimed that printers typically charged one thaler for each sheet of music (139), which for a standard set of five quarto partbooks would amount to 15 or 30 thalers (22½ or 45

florins) depending on whether the “sheet” was counted as both sides or just one. How this might square with the 600 florins that Andreas Hammerschmidt claimed as his expenses for printing his *Kirchen- und Tafelmusik* in 1662 (138)—even granting that this was a more complex edition—is anyone’s guess.

Rose tries to view these issues in the context of what he calls “early capitalism” (12), although the general lack of information in his book about the economics of the marketplace (even just concerning musicians’ salaries and the like) tends to weaken his case for a term that is itself somewhat problematic. Nor does he fully explain why music printing declined precipitously in the latter part of his period, reverting to a manuscript subculture, as it were, that had always operated for certain repertoires. It is clear from his discussion, however, that whatever system was in play, it generated significant anxieties. Composers feared for the fate of their music in terms of the threats of dissemination, criticism, plagiarism, and piracy to their professional standing and financial wellbeing. Patrons placed restrictions on the circulation of musical works created under their aegis and which they therefore felt they somehow owned. Institutions were apprehensive over the loss of musical traditions that granted some sense of permanence to an otherwise unstable social and political world. Consumers who browsed the music shelves of their local booksellers were often left alienated from works they could not possibly perform in any credible way. And two more fundamental anxieties undermined this neurotic musical world; first, musicians could too easily be accused of quackery (the subject of composer Johann Kuhnau’s satirical novel *Der musicalische Quack-Salber* published in 1700), and second, whether one read Plato or the Church Fathers it was clear that music was a dangerous art. How could one distinguish good works from bad? And to confront the elephant in the room in ways in which Rose does not—although it was acknowledged by many of his subjects—how could one assert the value of German music in the face of the Italian composers and performers who dominated significant parts of the market at the time? Not for nothing was the anti-hero of Kuhnau’s novel a German charlatan posing as an Italian virtuoso.

Plato’s ambivalence over the benefits of music for the well-ordered republic was extended by Augustine and Thomas Aquinas into no less

ambivalent arguments concerning the pleasures and perils of music for the Christian soul. The church ordinance issued in 1580 by Augustus, Elector of Saxony, sought to negotiate this minefield by setting strict limits on what those in charge of music in worship might do (164; with my editorial insertions):

They should diligently pay attention to the pastors, and earnestly ensure that they do not perform any of their own songs (should they be composers) or other new things. Instead, they should use pieces by old, outstanding composers who are experienced in this art, such as Josquin [des Prez; d. 1521], Clemens non Papa [d. 1555 or 1556] and Orlande de Lassus [d. 1594]. In particular, they should avoid songs that are based on dances or shameful tunes; instead they should use pieces that are dignified, stately and strong, and that will move the people to Christian devotion when sung in church.

Rose reads this as a statement of “Lutheran orthodoxy,” which is true, although in the face of the well-known pressures from the (Crypto-) Calvinists that Augustus was seeking to negate, one might construe it as a somewhat moderate position. That ordinance remained in notional force through much of the seventeenth century despite the efforts of composers to bring arguments against its utility and propriety, such as Christoph Schultze’s defense of musical innovation in 1643, and Kuhnau’s advocacy of flexibility in his *De juribus circa musicos ecclesiasticos* (1688).

Of course, both Augustine and Aquinas knew full well that to place any significant limits on music in church would force overcoming the wealth of Biblical and other statements in its favor. As Rose notes (181), Andreas Werkmeister was one of several composers who made the theological argument for musical innovation as a divine gift (in his case, in 1691):

Our dear forefathers exerted themselves to sing and play new songs to dear God. So we must not avoid this, especially as we see that God has given each and every musician always good and new inventions and ornaments. Who would be reluctant to use such good gifts to the glory of God?

The exhortation in the psalms that we should “sing unto the Lord a new song” was clear enough, although it could also be a convenient

excuse. Thus, when Adam Krieger applied for the position of *Kantor* at the Thomaskirche in Leipzig in 1657, he sought exemption from its typical teaching duties because his time would be better spent composing (45–46). Krieger’s application failed, but later holders of that position were better able to navigate the change in status. As Kuhnau wrote in 1709, there were also civic benefits to take into account: it was important that “especially on feast days and during trade fairs, foreign visitors and distinguished men judge there is something good to hear in the main churches” (181). However, given that the “old” music advocated in the 1580 ordinance was purely vocal, the increasing presence of instrumentalists in the main Lutheran churches had already made the acceptance of “new” music a *fait accompli*. Kuhnau’s successor, Johann Sebastian Bach, took full advantage of the situation precisely because, he wrote in 1730, “The state of music is quite different from what it was, since our artistry has increased very much, and the taste has changed astonishingly, and accordingly the former style of music no longer seems to please our ears” (loc. cit.).

Hence Rose is entirely correct to argue that the notion of what it meant to “make,” “create,” or “compose” music changed significantly during his period. But these issues probably played out differently across the various confessional divides in the German-speaking lands. The fact that his index has no entry for Calvinism on the one hand, and Catholicism on the other, seems to reflect a rather unusual blind spot in his coverage of a narrower topic than his title might suggest; in his Conclusion, he claims to have “exposed the rich complexities of Lutheran musical life between Schütz and Bach” (215)—as indeed he has—but Leipzig and Dresden were not Munich or, for that matter, Vienna. This is important not just because of the principle of *cuius regio, eius religio* and its institutional and devotional consequences, but also given the ways in which some music—and the attitudes associated with it—could cross boundaries that might otherwise seem less permeable. Rose observes (78–80) that the composer Johann Caspar Kerll (1627–1693) had a significant influence on composers up to Bach and even beyond, but does not engage with how his training and employment in a wholly Catholic environment might have affected matters.

Kerll is relatively unknown today—in part because a large number of his works have been lost—but his example reveals one last subtext that Rose could have brought more to the fore. He had a decent, though not stellar, musical career; however, he seems to have been a musicians' musician, often sought out as a teacher and as a source of musical models (so Pachelbel's and even Handel's music also make clear). Musical "authorship" was obviously a matter of public acknowledgment that would have a significant impact on a composer's career, income, and reputation. However, musicians then, as now, also operated within a relatively closed world with its own rules of association and behavior that might, in the end, be quite different from what was projected to patrons, employers, or even just society at large. Rose certainly does an outstanding job of identifying their performances—as it were—of identity in such broader spheres. But how Schütz, Bach, and others in between viewed these issues within their own particular domains may well be another story.

The Complete Works of John Milton. Volume XI: Manuscript Writings. William Poole, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. xiv + 473 pp. + 23 illus. \$175.00. Review by P.G. STANWOOD, UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

This volume, the most recent addition to the Oxford University Press edition of John Milton's complete works in a proposed thirteen volumes, offers freshly transcribed and copiously annotated texts of two autograph manuscripts: "The Commonplace Book" (BL Add. MS 36354), and "Ideas for Dramas" (aka "Outlines for Tragedies") in the Trinity College, Cambridge manuscript (James R.3.4) [pp. 35–41]—well known also for the revised versions of *Lycidas* and other poems by Milton. The edition includes as well Milton's presentation inscriptions to Patrick Young, Royal Librarian, and to John Rouse, Bodley's Librarian. William Poole, the indefatigable and immensely scrupulous editor, provides as well an appendix descriptive of the lost Index Theologicus, supposed a part of the Commonplace Book, while another appendix illustrates the scribal characteristics of Milton's amanuenses. There is, finally, the single leaf of text on the theme of

early rising, dubiously attributed to Milton.

The chief concern of this volume is of course the so-called *Commonplace Book* which its newest editor presents (one wishes) definitively in this, its fourth edition. The first edition was an imperfect transcript by its discoverer A.J. Horwood in 1876. Poole builds on his predecessors, especially J. H. Hanford and Ruth Mohl, of the Columbia and Yale editions, of 1938 and 1953, respectively. Poole's purpose in this Oxford edition is to provide not only a reliable text but also an extensive commentary on Milton's sources, with reference to their further use in the Miltonic canon. Poole quotes from contemporary sources that Milton might have used, and he translates non-English texts. He gives also textual and general introductions, and biobibliographies of the principal authors that Milton cites.

The long introduction to the major part of this volume is a fascinating description of the sort or kind of object with which we are concerned. Milton and his age regarded what we call "commonplace book" simply as a gathering of bound and blank manuscript leaves, ready for taking notes and so available for organizing one's knowledge—a kind of predecessor of the filing cabinet. Milton's practice, and that of his contemporaries, was to enter references under fixed, general topics; these citations would be placed under the appropriate heading. Such reading notes would of course help one to remember the larger work. One conventional means of organization, which Milton follows, was to set down three major heads or divisions under which all notes accordingly are given: *Index Ethicus* [Ethical Index]; *Index OEconomicus* [Economic Index]; *Index Politicus* [Political Index]. Yet the conventional form of Milton's commonplace book is distinctive in certain respects. Milton is notably systematic and methodical, with terse, well-referenced excerpts, and an exact index. Also notable is Milton's "thrift," for a very high proportion of entries are deployed in the prose works. "Sustained exposure to this manuscript," Poole observes, "invites the conclusion that Milton had more than an inkling of an idea about his own literary future, especially as a writer of prose" (60). Milton, indeed, used his commonplace book as a source for his polemical prose.

Milton began his commonplace book, the present editor believes, no later than 1636, a judgment he bases in part on palaeographical

evidence as well as on the kind of notes that reflected his reading at this time. Moreover, we are reminded that Milton, “across 1634 to 1636,” was no longer writing the miniscule ‘a’ with a downstroke from the upper right-hand side (77). An analogous situation occurs in the Trinity (“Lycidas”) manuscript, where “early” Milton writes with the epsilon ‘ε’ and later with the italic ‘e.’ Poole summarizes and renews here and throughout his edition the earlier scholarship of Parker, Hanford, Shawcross, Lewalski—updating and expanding their work and that of others. He offers an engaging account of difficult issues and documents. His review of Milton’s access to books, in an early section of the introduction, carefully examines the most frequent speculations about Milton’s use of libraries, noting the likeliest possibilities: Cambridge, Hammersmith, Horton, the Kederminster Library of Langley, and London. Kederminster is most unlikely, Poole believes, because of the restrictions of its rules whereby every reader was carefully monitored and no reader left unattended. Such a place was unsuitable for serious and sustained reading, where “it is also rather cold” (21). Having considered the several libraries where Milton, in need of books, has been alleged to have studied, Poole favors the strong possibility that Milton relied upon his own collection of books that with the help of friends he was steadily amassing.

The original manuscript contains many additions by Milton’s amanuenses, and by some later owners. At an early stage, some of the leaves were torn away or otherwise mutilated, and so the pages actually used by Milton occupy rather less than half of the whole. Not one of the three organizing categories of Ethics, Economics, or Politics has enough entries to fill even half of its allotted space so that “only a third of the total manuscript was ever colonized by Miltonic hands....[W]e must come to the conclusion that this is a manuscript dominated by blank space” (9). But we may be assured that the editor has given all of the Miltonic text, stripping away any later or non-Miltonic interventions. Just when the manuscript ceased to be used by Milton or his amanuenses is difficult to say with any certainty, but Poole believes that its use certainly “tailed off . . . from around the point Milton went totally blind” in February 1652, with a few entries in the late 1650s, and possibly later (81).

The most essential feature of this edition, along with a new transcription of the text is the extremely full and detailed annotation. Poole explains his method of annotation, noting the scribe for each entry or “block”—that is, Milton himself or an amanuensis—and the likely date of entry; a reference to Hanford’s edition; author and work cited; and publication and other locating details. Now follows: “Commentary, with quotation and translation where necessary, on the agreement or otherwise between the citation and the source text. Any further editorial commentary, including notices of pertinent discussions in contemporary or secondary sources. Parallels from Milton’s other works, or within this manuscript . . . if appropriate” (110–111). Moreover, the editor gives “other observations or information, e.g. on the headings themselves, on palaeography, on matters of translation or interpretation, on (further) parallels from contemporary texts and modern scholarship on them, or noting cross-references” (111). To consult at random any citation reveals the intelligence and full realization of this ambitious editorial plan.

The much briefer and less demanding text in the latter portion of this volume receives similarly scrupulous attention. The notes for putative dramas that Milton recorded in the Trinity College manuscript are well known but nowhere so efficiently and helpfully described. Poole argues convincingly that they date from 1639, after Milton’s return from his continental tour; they follow the much-revised “Lycidas” and precede the sonnet to Henry Lawes (dated 9 February 1645). Poole gives circumstantial evidence that the notes were completed by late 1641, a date provided by *The Reason of Church Government* (January 1642), “where Milton states that he had searched ‘our own ancient stories’ for material appropriate for literary adaptation” (305).

These pages of the Trinity manuscript have traditionally been called “Outlines for Tragedies.” Poole, however, noting that most of the pages contain only headings, occasional outlines, and few tragedies, prefers the title “Ideas for Dramas.” In his cogent introduction, he discusses the possibilities implied in these fragments that recollect various biblical narratives and British tragedies, the latter indebted especially to Holinshed’s *Chronicles* and Speed’s *History*. Milton’s interest in dramatic work was no doubt stimulated by his early experience of Latin university plays, and later during his continental travels, espe-

cially through his exposure to the music and culture of Italy. He is even supposed to have turned to opera. In view especially of “Adam unparadiz’d,” Edmund Gosse, writing in 1900, “interpreted the drafts as materials for ‘choral plays’” (321).

A final comment, not about this excellent edition but about its physical presentation. Oxford retains its familiar format for scholarly and academic volumes though the elegance of the Clarendon Press long ago disappeared; now the digitalized printing, faux binding, and brittle paper stock result in an awkward book whose loose pages refuse to lie flat and continue to spring up, even after sustained use—a disadvantage for a book that must serve essentially as a reference work.

Brendan Prawdzik. *Theatrical Milton: Politics and Poetics of the Staged Body*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2018. xii + 249 pp. Review by ANTHONY WELCH, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE.

John Milton was a closet dramatist in more than one sense. The author of college orations, a courtly masque, an unstaged biblical tragedy, and a sheaf of unfinished dramatic sketches, Milton felt a lifelong desire to stage dialogue and debate in the public eye. Yet he often contemplated the theater from a wary distance. He produced no dramatic works for London’s playhouses or the royal court. Some of his later writings even seem to share the anti-theatrical prejudice of the godly reformers who closed the public theaters in 1642. In *Theatrical Milton*, Brendan Prawdzik aims to trace Milton’s shifting attitudes toward drama and performance. His goal is not to probe Milton’s outlook on a particular dramatic author or tradition. Instead, Prawdzik explores the concept of “theatricality” in Milton’s poetry and prose. In Prawdzik’s hands, this is a broad, capacious term, incorporating a wide range of rhetorical postures and thematic patterns. At the core of Milton’s theatricality, he contends, are two abiding concerns: the uneasy power dynamics that link performer and audience, and the crucial role of the author’s “staged body” in his rhetorical self-presentation.

Prawdzik claims that Milton’s readers have long neglected the close partnership between rhetoric and theatricality in seventeenth-century culture. With mixed success, he argues that this relationship is rooted

in the Greco-Roman rhetorical canon of *pronuntiatio* (delivery), since classical orators, much like theater actors, were trained in the use of *actio* (voice and gesture) to move their audiences. When Milton presented himself to his readers as a public rhetor, Prawdzik argues, he often framed those writings as quasi-dramatic performances. By “theatricalizing the scene of writing” (219), Milton found powerful new ways to shape his authorial identity, but he was also forced to confront the power that his audiences wielded over him: “Spectators and actor are not simply bound by a negotiated desire; they are also engaged in an agonistic relationship, each seeking a type of dominion over the other” (10). Prawdzik’s secondary claim—always intriguing, not always persuasive—is that Milton came to locate this sense of vulnerability in his own performing body, riskily exposed to public view: its unruly passions, its entanglements in gender and desire, and its susceptibility to the corrupting will of his audience.

In a wide-ranging first chapter, Prawdzik analyzes Milton’s “At a Vacation Exercise” (ca. 1631) alongside the political prose and *Paradise Lost*. Milton’s early poem formed part of a “salting” ceremony at Cambridge, an initiatory ritual that included formal orations (later published by Milton as Prolusion 6) and a comic interlude. Prawdzik points out that scholars too often disregard this poem’s dramatic contexts and concerns. As master of ceremonies, Milton explores his own “ambivalent identity . . . as both an orator and an actor” (23). In these early public writings, he voices anxieties about theatricality and performance that will linger throughout his career. He tries to balance high seriousness with crude farce. He worries aloud that his audience is hostile and will hiss him off the stage, as they compete with him “to control the plane of representation” (23). He is unsure whether or how to expose his private selfhood to public view. He portrays himself by turns as masculine and feminine—a series of gender inversions that speaks to the “constantly oscillating negotiation of authority between desiring bodies” in theatrical space (28). Prawdzik extends these patterns into *Paradise Lost*, notably in the figure of Satan. Milton undermines Satan’s authority by portraying him as an actor who loses control of his own performing body. He can disguise himself as a cherub to deceive Uriel, for example, but the angel later spies Satan’s face contorted with rage and despair on Mount Niphates, “suggesting

through the represented body a counter-influence of passion flowing in from a fleshy field of the visible" (34) that exposes his true nature.

Chapter 2 reads *A Maske Presented at Ludlow Castle* as Milton's effort to come to grips with the moral threats and affordances of stage drama. Rejecting the hardline anti-theatricalists from Tertullian to William Prynne, Milton sought to reform English drama as a tool of godly instruction. He knew, however, that "the vices and desires of the audience" threatened the author's own identity, torn between his competing roles as a private, chaste man of God and an exposed public figure who "longs to merge" with his readers (52–53). In *A Maske*, the endangered Lady embodies Milton's own plight as a dramatist—and, more broadly, as a moral agent in a fallen world: "as a staged woman, she embodies the vulnerability of the divine poet who would be public yet who also would be chaste" (54). Comus and his wild revelers assault the Lady's emergent selfhood by making her an object of male spectatorship, whether through the lens of anti-theatrical misogyny (as an unchaste female performer) or of Petrarchan idealism (as a passive object of male desire). Imprisoned by the corrupting gaze of these male audiences, the Lady is liberated by the water nymph Sabrina, who represents Milton's own ideal of "a chaste theatre" (53) and enables the Lady to recover her autonomous embodied selfhood. Yet she finally returns home, silent and under male escort, because her public role as a female moral agent must remain provisional or incomplete until the theater audience itself—at Ludlow and across the nation—has also undergone reform.

Prawdzik's third chapter traces motifs of theatricality and performance in Milton's political prose of the early 1640s. The early prose tracts frame Milton's "theological polemic as a type of stage performance within the implied theatre of an invigorated print culture" (90). Milton's *Animadversions*, with its patchwork dialogue between Remonstrant and Answerer, exposes the Laudian clergy to the ridicule of hostile readers who are both a jury and a theater audience. The Answerer adopts a satirical posture that Prawdzik associates with the figure of the stage fool, even as Milton attacks the bishops for imposing rituals of worship that amount to "hypocritical disguise and rigidly scripted performance" (95). When Milton's enemies returned fire in the anonymous *Modest Confutation* (ca. 1642), he learned to

his dismay that his theatrical tropes could be weaponized against him. Now called a “scurrilous mime” and a frequenter of lewd plays (108), Milton anxiously distanced himself from stage performance in his later polemical tracts. In *Eikonoklastes* (1649), for example, he reaches for anti-theatrical discourses when he portrays King Charles I’s ostentatious prayers as “soliloquies,” and he mocks the notorious frontispiece of *Eikon Basilike* as “a Masking Scene” (118). Since Prawdzik provides scant evidence of kinship between stage foolery and Milton’s satirical persona in *Animadversions*, it is hard to agree with him that Milton “had embodied the gesturing fool” (112) or “the overacting comedian” (113) in his public debut. Nonetheless, Milton’s drift toward anti-theatricality over the 1640s is noteworthy. Could this pattern shed light on Milton’s choice to abandon the sketches for a biblical tragedy that he drafted during these years?

Prawdzik briefly discusses Milton’s dramatic sketches in Chapter 4, which explores theatricality and spectatorship in *Paradise Lost*. Many scholars, notably Barbara Lewalski, Helen Gardner, and John G. Demaray, have approached Milton’s epic as a composite of literary forms that strategically evokes dramatic genres and conventions. Prawdzik acknowledges their work but turns instead to the early modern science of optics to explore the dynamics of seeing and being seen in *Paradise Lost*. While Descartes and Hobbes pioneered new models of perception that posited a crisp, clear subject-object relationship between the seer and the seen, Prawdzik argues that Milton relied on older “extramissive” theories of vision, which draw mutual lines of influence between the viewer and the perceived object. Prawdzik highlights key moments in *Paradise Lost* when Adam and Eve are watched, or believe themselves to be watched, by observers whose gaze exerts power over their motives and choices—a pattern that culminates in Satan’s effort to persuade Eve that the stars shine all night only to gaze at her loveliness. Somewhat less compelling is Prawdzik’s claim that “peripheral vision ... proves central to the psychology of the Fall” (142), on the grounds that objects not clearly perceived by the viewer can exert a malign influence below the level of consciousness. Thus, Satan corrupts Eve by “populating the periphery of her visible imaginary with gazing eyes” (146), making Eve unconsciously perceive herself as object rather than subject, and thereby imposing

his demonic will on her theatrical body.

In a concluding chapter on *Samson Agonistes*, Prawdzik argues that Milton's closet drama ponders the ambiguous role of the body and the passions in Christian ethics. Skeptical of the critical view that Milton's Samson undergoes a process of spiritual regeneration, Prawdzik finds instead "a counterplot of exacerbated passions that concludes in the explosion, as it were, of a powder keg" (185). On this reading, the drama's notorious crux—what is the source of the mysterious "rousing motions" that prompt Samson's slaughter of the Philistines?—is deliberately unclear. Milton calls upon his Christian readers to examine their own mysterious inner latticework of flesh and spirit. Samson's "signifying body" is "an ambiguous sign of carnal, spiritual or hybrid passions that encourages the reader . . . to identify with Samson and his passions and, thereby, to work toward discerning and testing those passions within" (203). Citing some intriguing parallels with the Quaker movement, Prawdzik shows how its enemies mocked the histrionic activity of the Quaker body as a symbol of their antinomian theology. This is a thoughtful extension of prior scholarship on Milton and the Quakers, whether or not we agree with Prawdzik's claim (based on a precarious reading of lines 1646–51) that "Samson's body . . . resemble[s] the trembling body of the Quaker" when he pulls down the pillars of Dagon's theater (180).

Readers of *Theatrical Milton* will admire the author's daring synthesis of rhetorical treatises, polemical tracts, scientific discourses, literary intertexts, and performance studies to frame Milton's beliefs about authorship and agency. This study joins a growing corpus of scholarship that locates the body—its experiences, its deficiencies, its negotiations between self and world—at the heart of Milton's life and work, such as *Immortality and the Body in the Age of Milton* (2018), edited by Stephen Fallon and John Rumrich, or Naya Tsentourou's *Milton and the Early Modern Culture of Devotion: Bodies at Prayer* (2017). Prawdzik's ambitious book is full of unexpected insights and nimble close readings. Sometimes, however, he does impose his own will too forcefully upon Milton's textual body. In "At a Vacation Exercise," for example, Milton wittily portrays himself as the father of the ten Aristotelian categories of Substance—a paternal role, he jokes, that hardly accords with his feminine nickname, the Lady of Christ's

College. Milton soon readies himself to express “some naked thoughts that rove about / And loudly knock to have their passage out” (quoted in Prawdzik 27). This stage performance, Prawdzik explains, feminizes the poet (31) and thereby places him in a transsexual subject position (32), one that arises from the “ambiguous intertwining of flesh and the forces [of desire] that move it” (33). The public spectacle of the poet’s transsexual body threatens his identity even as it lends him authorial power:

Milton locates the menace that attends theatricality in the genitals themselves, the epicentre of the possibly exposed. As the source of reproductive power and as the anchor of gendered identity, they are, as well, a sign of poetic authority. In the negotiations of the theatricalised rhetorical situation, the genitals are a locus of shape-shifting and of potential castration. (35)

Those of us who are unable to find any genitals in this early poem might question Prawdzik’s analysis, but we can still learn much from him about Milton’s struggle to negotiate his identity under the “hostile gaze felt to issue from a social body, a panoptic God, or the conscience or superego” (35). This is the work of a bold scholar, willing to take imaginative risks, and eager to bring Milton into new realms of literary criticism and theory that have too often left him behind.

J. Caitlin Finlayson & Amrita Sen, eds. *Civic Performance: Pageantry and Entertainments in Early Modern England*. London & New York: Routledge, 2020. xiv + 254 pp. 8 illustrations. Review by J. P. CONLAN, UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO, RIO PIEDRAS CAMPUS.

Taken on its own terms, J. Caitlin Finlayson’s & Amrita Sen’s edited collection of eleven essays on Civic Performance puts in competition three strategies of organization for volumes on civic pageant: “Civic to Global,” “Material Encounters,” and “Methodologies for Re-Viewing Performance.” The division into three parts implicitly asks the reader, by way of representative samples, which of these schemes of organization produces a collection that hangs together best. From the outset, though, the three-part division of the volume obfuscates that, under the rubric of civil pageantry, the collection treats two very different

genres of occasional drama that were staged in the city streets: the Lord Mayor's Show, which is occasional drama supplemented by architectural forms aimed at celebrating a particular Lord Mayor's installation, and the Joyous Entry, an occasional drama supplemented by architectural forms that cast in epideictic form a city's or contingent's metaphoric expression of homage to the City's governing prince.

Of the essays that discuss the Lord Mayor's show, the jewel of the collection is chapter 5, Ian W. Archer's "The social and political dynamics of the Lord Mayor's Show, c. 1550–1700" (93–115).

Taking issue with the restrictive focus of REED on reporting the mere dramatic elements of the Lord Mayor's Shows, Archer privileges contemporaneous reception evidence to highlight the importance of what generally has been pushed to the margins but was of crucial significance to the success of the ceremonies celebrating the Lord Mayor's installation. Among these features generally overlooked in the study of the Lord Mayor's Shows, Archer illustrates, are questions of precedence in the procession, ceremonial feasting, the dressing of the poor and issues of funding, the execution of which was at least as important to the received success of the celebration as the dramatic enactments and architectural dimensions informing the Lord Mayor's shows themselves.

Of the essays that discuss Joyous Entries, the finest scholarship can be found in the related cluster of three essays near the end of the volume, chapters 8 to 10, which touch on different aspects of James VI's 1604 Joyous Entry into London:

In chapter 8, "The Duke of Lennox and civic entertainments" (157–175), David Bergeron discusses the entrance and other civic performances from the point of view of James's favorite, Ludovic Stuart, Duke of Lennox. Bergeron highlights that Lennox was an important figure in the world of Stuart civic pageants and entertainments; Lennox had helped arrange the Joyous Entry of King James and Queen Anne into Edinburgh in 1590; when in England, Lennox was one of the very few noblemen outside of the royal family who had a playing company under his command. Lennox not only sponsored George Chapman, but he also danced in Jonson's masques. Not surprisingly, Lennox also accompanied James and Anne as part of their entourage in their Joyous Entry into London in 1604. Bergeron's narration of the

Earl of Lennox's experience gives the reader a street-level experience of what this nobleman and likely, thereby, the King must have seen on this occasion. Welcome digressions detailing what Lennox might have seen on other occasions throughout James I's English reign vest the readers in a sense of the cultural richness that the well-connected such as Lennox must have felt experiencing various types of civic pageants year after year.

Bergeron's account of Lennox's experiences prepares the reader well for the deep dive in chapter 9, "Stephen Harrison's *The Arches of Triumph* (1604) and James I's royal entry in the London literary marketplace" (176–199). Relying on Harrison's own printed illustrations and Jonson's and Dekker's conflicting contemporaneous written accounts, Finlayson details the visual aspects of the 1604 royal entry's seven arches, five of which Harrison designed himself. As it happens, Harrison left accurate dimensions of none of these arches in the Folio he printed afterwards, presumably for the city's governing merchant class (181). It perhaps need not be pointed out that members of Harrison's intended audience were already elite readers in that they had already paid for the arches' fabrication in conformity with prior plans and had personally already experienced the scale of them themselves. The essay speaks both to the specifics of the architecture and artistic design and the style whereby literary commendation and book culture were used to keep the memory of the dismantled triumphal arches alive.

Chapter 10, "Musical Transformations of the city soundscape: King James I's entry into London in 1604" (200–218), beautifully complements the prior two essays: Katherine Butler reminds the audience that the aural elements of the procession, within its cheering, trumpets and drums, now lost to us, had an immediate effect on the aesthetics of the occasion. Of the three essays in this cluster, however, Butler's essay is somewhat less successful. In part the mediated success arises because evidence is lacking: the music, likely improvised drums and trumpets, aurally learned, was not published, and all the reader has to go on are accounts by Jonson, Dugdale, and Dekker, and only the latter "pays sustained attention to the music" (202), in copying out the lyrics to five songs. In part, however, the success of the essay is compromised by a potential overreaching of the evidence: Butler

presumes that Harrison's artistic renditions of musicians and instruments on the arches signal which sort of music was played where.

A further problem of contextualization arises in the discussion of the greeting of James at the Arch of Fame, where Butler presumes that the author of the pageant merely honors a universal trope in addressing the King of Great Britain as a type of Apollo. The compliment is unquestionably more personal to the king: King James VI of Scotland was himself a poet who lay down rules of prosody in *Essayes of a Prentise* (Edinburgh, 1585). Indeed, his own efforts at sonnet writing as King of Scotland is likely the direct font of inspiration for the sonnet pattern most commonly today known as "English" and "Shakespearean" because his most famous Groom of the Chamber imitated his master's form.

The rest of the essays in the collection are a mixed bag; valuable information can be found in each of them, but often, because of the scholar's focus on cataloguing specific tropes and figures in the representations, rhetorical intentions of the makers are ignored, and conclusions about contemporaneous meaning are improperly reached or not reached at all.

In the first chapter, "To the Honour of our Nation abroad': The merchant as adventurer in civic pageantry" (13–31), Tracey Hill challenges the Neoliberal presumption that "[t]he pageantry associated with the installation of the chief officer of the city in the early modern period ... [served] to glamorize and praise the mercantile endeavours that underpinned the wealth of the city's oligarchs, and to trumpet their every wider global reach" (13). After laying out in great detail that Lord Mayors Thomas Smith, Maurice Abbot, Christopher Clitherow, William Cockayne, John Watts, Henry Garway, Hugh Hammersly, John Spencer, Richard Deane, Thomas Middleton, Leonard Holliday, John Swinnerton, Thomas Hayes, John Leman, George Bowles, Francis Barkham, John Gore, and James Campbell were high-ranking members or shareholders in the East India Company, and that some of these and other Lord Mayors invested in the Levant Company and the Muscovy Company, Hill's analysis takes a unfortunate turn; focusing on the figure of the merchant adventurer within a large number of pageants, Hill argues the representation ambiguous, referencing, on the one hand, the city merchants' mission in pageants that "attempted

to link mercantile and spiritual endeavours" (17), and, on the other, a geographic lack of precision that, in Hill's opinion, "mimicked a prevalent indifference within the population at large to those places that were the source of that wealth" (26). To prove the "prevalent indifference" of the pageant's use of "exotic color" (26), Hill cites to various errors in the pageants: Munday's reference to goldsmith's precious metals coming from India in *Chrusothriambos* (25); Tumanama a sixteenth-century Caribbean king rather than a queen (25); Middleton's use of 'Moors' to stand in for 'eastern' nations in *The Tryumphs of Truth* (24); and *The Tryumphes of Peace* misplacing of a branch of a nutmeg tree in the headdress of the figure of Africa (25).

Far more revelatory of the complimentary appeal of these civic performances would this analysis have been had Hill presumed a rhetorical rather than a mimetic purpose for the errors in these Lord Mayors' Shows; quoting to the opening epistle of Richard Willes's *The Travailes of the English in the East and West Indies* (London, 1577), Hill might have demonstrated that geography was the most important field of knowledge of the age, and, once shown, Hill might easily have demonstrated that these Lord Mayors' Shows with their deliberate misrepresentations of product origins in the world aimed at and served to differentiate the London public audience into groups of elite and naïve knowers on the basis of their ability to discern accurate representations of geography from fictional travelers' tales. Into the group of the elite, most obviously, would have been the Lord Mayors with their extensive experience in London's several trading companies. Certainly they, unlike those Londoners unlearned in geography, would have recognized the pageants' misrepresentations off the bat.

Lack of attention to the knowledge of audience-addressed rhetoric also troubles the analysis in chapter 2, "Locating the rhinoceros and the Indian: Strangers, trade and the East India Company in Thomas Heywood's *Porta Pietatis*" (32–34), where Amrita Sen argues that Heywood's *Porta Pietatis* juxtaposes a shepherd with his sheep and an East Indian with a rhinoceros so "as to respond to a moment of an uneasy transition to a more globalized economy that made itself felt both in terms of changing markets and the arrival of new demographic groups in London" (33). Unfortunately, Sen wholly neglects the importance of Thomas Heywood's epistle to Maurice Abbot that

opens the published pageant, in which Heywood addresses the new Lord Mayor not only as a tradesman, which certainly he was, but more specifically and personally as the son of the late Archbishop of Canterbury George Abbot. As it happens, George Abbot taught geography at Saint Mary's College in Oxford University, served as Vice Chancellor of that University several times, and acquitted himself well as Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry and Bishop of London before King James appointed him Archbishop of Canterbury on 4 March 1611.

Omitting any consideration of the opening epistle other than mentioning Maurice Abbot's name, Sen neglects to contextualize the celebration of Maurice Abbot in *Porta Pietatis* against the intellectual legacy that the Archbishop George Abbot left his son. This intellectual legacy included sundry theological and academic publications, including the geographical text taught at Oxford since Elizabeth's time, *A Briefe Description of the Whole World* (in its fifth edition by 1620). So contextualized, the pageant develops in its several shows as a progressive compliment to this Lord Mayor, the son of a geographically knowledgeable Archbishop, that moves from pagan prophet Proteus to a humble shepherd with his useful sheep, from an Indian keeping his rhino that is fierce against predators to the remarks an English seaman appreciative of his City's Lord, finally, to the Christian Citadel in which dwells the figure of Piety, London's Lady seneschal under the command, presumably of this newly installed Lord Mayor, Maurice Abbot, whose paternal heritage and former occupancy of Lambeth Palace ensures that London, in its trade abroad, operates to advance the City of God.

Casual reading of *Porta Pietatis* shows that Heywood hammers home the moral of the pageant in the Speech at Night that concludes it. According to the prophet Proteus, the shepherd is useful, the rhinoceros is protective, the merchant achieves status by his trade, "But," under this particular Lord Mayor's guidance, like a lighthouse or a compass, "*Piety* doth point You to that Starre, / By which good Merchants steere."

The final two chapters of the first section, which consider three different Joyous Entries, betray similar flaws in focus: in the search for figural significance on a completely mimetic plane, the City's interest in defining its interests to its prince, which the Joyous Entries

presumptively defined in metaphoric terms, is never even discussed.

In chapter three, for instance, entitled, “Cleopatra in Her Barge’: Anne Boleyn’s coronation pageants and the production of English cultural capital,” (50–69), Sarah Crover concerns herself with the extent that Anne’s coronation pageant imitated or exceeded the coronation pageants of past queens Catherine of Aragon and Elizabeth of York. Lost in this comparison is the topical meaning of the event. In problematizing Cleopatra and Venus as mythically seductive figures that led men to their deaths and focusing only on Anne’s pregnancy, Crover overlooks what Anne Boleyn’s marriage to Henry VIII meant for London City trade. Had Crover altered her focus toward the rhetoric, Crover might have shown how Queen Anne Boleyn’s favorable reception by London as a type of Cleopatra or Cyprian Venus, who first travelled over the water into London and then who was then led overland into London by a procession of twelve Frenchmen to be received by Henry VIII, implicitly complimented Henry as a type of Caesar whose subjects’ claims to free commerce with Africa or trade in the Levant or excursions in the West Indies neither the bishop of Rome, rejected by the reception of Anne Boleyn as Henry’s wife, nor the King of Spain and Holy Roman Emperor, undoubtedly offended by Anne’s use of Catherine of Aragon’s own barge, would be allowed jurisdiction at admiralty to preclude.

Similarly incomplete is chapter 4, entitled, “The Unspoken language of aliens, or the Spectacular conversation between visiting English and Dutch that transcended time and space” (70–89). Certainly, Nancy Kay recognizes that

The cost of a typical early modern royal entry was enormous and, for the most part, was assumed by the municipal government and guilds the host city, [and] [i]n exchange, these cities were granted the rare opportunity to present their royal guest with their most urgent concerns in the form of public entertainments” (70, rehearsing citations).

But still, in her attempt to put into meaningful conversation with each other a pageant performed by English merchants in Antwerp at the Joyous Entry of Philip of Antwerp in 1549 and the Dutch pageant performed in London at the Joyous Entry of King James I in 1604, Kay focuses exclusively on imagery and pageant architecture to the

exclusion of what specific rights and privileges each contingent of alien merchants wished the sovereign to confirm on each occasion. The warrant for this omission is neither historically nor etymologically sound. The very term “joyous entry” means the first official peaceable visit of the ruling prince at which time, typically, the rights of the city and entities within the city were confirmed and extended.

Kay’s discussion of the Joyous Entry in 1549 details how the English merchants in Antwerp invoke the British origins of the Holy Roman Empire in Constantine and Saint Helen through their late descendant Henry VIII, (though succeeded by Edward VI) and highlights the common enemy in the Turk. Nonetheless, staying strictly within a formalist mode in which only the representation is the object of study, Kay neglects the contemporaneous rhetorical context that informed the intent of the expenditures and design and, presumably, within which these pageants were understood by the Princes before whom they were presented. That is, Kay provides no sense of the international tensions or reversals of foreign policies that might dissuade Philip of Antwerp from extending the rights and privileges of English aliens in this City, nor does Kay even indicate what these privileges were. The reader thereby derives no understanding of what actually was at stake when these English aliens, now subjects of King Edward VI, invested such time, treasure and industry in staging a pageant for Prince Philip that alluded to the British origins of the Holy Roman Empire that Philip was destined to inherit.

The omission of the specific context of communication between alien and sovereign becomes all the more glaring as Kay moves on to discussing James’s Joyous Entry into London in 1604. Certainly, Kay describes the Dutch contribution of an arch to the Joyous Entry in all of its imagery, a feature that links this Kay’s contribution to chapters 8, 9 and 10. However, toward the end of suggesting that “[t]he time and space between the entry of Philip in 1549 and that of James in 1604 begin to collapse when one realizes the web of dynastic interconnections that these two arches and their corresponding events represent” (77), Kay omits to note the very important fact of reception that, in his 1604 Joyous Entry, James rode past the Dutch display, staring straight ahead, without slowing down even to look at it. Despite the elaborate Flemish panels, despite his and his wife’s well-documented

respect for Flemish painters, James in his Joyous Entry into London paid no mind either to the Dutch actors' pleadings representing themselves as orphans living in exile, nor to the sumptuous works of art that the Dutch had invested so much money, time and thought in creating, presumably so as to persuade James to advance their cause.

In chapter 7, "Financial Encounter Customs: Tradition and Form in London's Civic Pageantry" (138–53), Jill Ingraham focuses on the trope of gift-giving. Certainly, gift-giving is an important feature of many entertainments and civic ceremonies that help articulate in concrete terms the relationship of the city to the person who is being honored. And Ingraham includes much interesting information in the piece about gifts given in Elizabethan and Jacobean shows. In this essay, however, Ingraham focuses her attention on (a) two of Anthony Munday's Lord Mayors' Shows performed in 1605 and 1611, (b) the Joyous Entry of Prince Henry into London in 1610 and (c) Ben Jonson's private entertainment for King James and Queen Anne at the House of William Cornwallis at Highgate in 1604. The analysis is not particularly rigorous, nor does it appear to be set up to be. Generically, Lord Mayor Show, Joyous Entry and Masque use gift-giving differently. These differences are not discussed. Belying the materialist focus of the section, two of these performances—Prince Henry's Joyous Entry and the Highgate entertainment—stage no giving of tangible objects at all. Corinea in *London's Love* offers Prince Henry the City's "boundless love," and May in Jonson's masque offers the promise of future gifts.

Finally, Ingraham stops short of identifying the real giver in the Lord Mayor's Show of 1605, Anthony Munday's *Triumphs of a Re-united Britain*, dedicated to Lord Sir Leonard Holliday of the Merchant Taylors, where the gift-giving constitutes a random scattering into the watching public of imported pepper, cloves and mace. Presumably, these spices were paid for prior to the performance. But Ingraham never clarifies whether the spices were purchased with public funds, whether they were paid for out of Holliday's own pocket, or whether the East India Company donated the spices to the performance, so it never becomes clear whether the so-called unity advertised in Munday's title for this Lord Mayor's Show derives from Holliday's own largesse, his willingness to use municipal moneys to subsidize East India Company merchants, or the East India Company's enthusiastic

support of his candidacy against a less well-liked contender. Because of Ingraham's oversight, the meaning of Munday's title—and perhaps the origins of the city fathers' preference for Munday over Middleton—never comes to light.

The final essay of the collection, chapter 11, "Building a Digital Geospatial Anthology of the Mayoral Shows," (219–238), appears to the reader as a breath of fresh air. The essays in general are largely ambitious for the reader, requiring that the reader have full knowledge of the entertainments and sites within London in which they were played to make sense of them. Shifting back and forth between time and space to consider specific tropes that appear in one pageant or another within the ten prior essays presents a daunting task on the first reading, and the promise of an electronic digital edition that allows Lord Mayors' Shows to be overlain one atop the other in their place in London town tenders to the exhausted reader initially a promise of relief in bringing the already published editions of Lord Mayors' Shows and civic pageants in one place, and, simultaneously allowing scholars to "drill down" based on the specific urban space in the London streets.

The value of the promised electronic edition, of course, depends on the execution. Enthusiastic assertions that "our editions of the memorial Shows promises to bring users closer to the original performances by documenting the events beyond the book and relocalising the Shows in London's streets," and "MoEML's technologies allow us to arrive at a closer approximation of these performances and processions by breaking the book and looking outside of the linguistic codes for materials and records that also bear witness to these previously inaccessible ceremonies" (220), suggest something approaching Peter Quill's holographic projection on Morad at the opening of *Guardians of the Galaxy* rather than the hypertext coding and document stacks that the electronic edition, attaching sites of pageant arches to the Map of Early Modern London, will likely provide. All hyperbole aside, the publication of all of the Lord Mayors' Shows and London civic pageants in one place, attached to a map of Early Modern London, is likely to be useful, at least in providing easy widespread access to the visual and verbal context of works, frequently considered ephemeral, that certainly informed the literary, political, and artistic culture of the time.

In many ways, this collection is useful in the same way. Regardless of the flaws in argumentation, each chapter has extensive notes and a bibliography of several pages. The essays explore many different pageants in many different ways. Each essay provokes thinking on material that, in Early Modern literature classes, is generally not deemed canonical. And each scholar engages with his or her material seriously, lending the study of civic performance, whether Lord Mayors' Shows or Joyous Entries, a *gravitas* that the material may not have enjoyed before. The strength of the collection is that it offers grist for further analysis all in one place. In that way, *Civic Performance: Pageantry and Entertainments in Early Modern England* constitutes a welcome contribution to the field.

Chanita Goodblatt. *Jewish and Christian Voices in English Reformation Drama: Enacting Family and Monarchy*. London: Routledge, 2018. xiii + 256 pp. \$155.00. Review by DARRYL TIPPENS, ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY.

Professor Goodblatt's study is an exercise in intertextuality in which the author considers the "reciprocal illumination" of the Bible, various "exegetical" and political texts, and three biblically based dramas written and performed in sixteenth-century England. These plays, according to Goodblatt, are rich in political and religious meanings when read within the elaborate sign systems involving a variety of Jewish and Christian "voices" that include sixteenth-century translations of the Bible, Bible commentaries, sermons, political documents, diaries, biblical epic, and Medieval and Early Modern plays. This intertextual approach to the drama of the English Reformation raises important questions about family, gender, and monarchy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The expansive range of texts considered in the study is its signature feature and its central challenge.

The book focuses on three dramas: *The Enterlude of Godly Queene Hester* (1561), *The Historie of Jacob and Esau* (1568), and George Peele's *The Love of King David and Fair Bethsabe, with the Tragedie of Absalon* (1599). Viewing these three plays as "exegetical and performative response[s] to the Bible," Goodblatt aims to answer these questions:

“what are the particular gaps in the biblical text, to which the play is responding? what are the specific concerns (or preconceptions) that have guided the playwright in the choice of the biblical text to be dramatized—and in the choice of performative decisions (e.g., the dramatization of particular scenes, the inclusion of extra-biblical characters, the addition of stage directions)? and how do contemporaneous political events and texts impact these performative (ultimately interpretive) decisions?” (9).

The decision to study Reformation biblical drama in dialogue with Jewish and Christian “voices” is a promising one since England and Protestant Europe were a fertile home for Jewish and Christian biblical scholarship in the sixteenth century. Goodblatt observes, “From the beginning of early modern biblical scholarship, Jewish and Christian voices have been intermingled” (9). Almost all the English translations of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Bibles—beginning with Tyndale’s unfinished translation of the Hebrew Bible and running through the Authorized (King James) Version—benefited from the labors of devoted Christian Hebraists. Like Luther, they studied Hebrew, knew Jewish commentaries, and translated directly from the Hebrew text, no longer limited to the Latin Vulgate as the primary source. Not unlike those Early Modern students of Hebrew, Goodblatt’s knowledge of the Hebrew Bible, midrash, Talmud, and other Jewish sources brings a richness to her readings of Reformation plays based upon classic Bible narratives.

The book is arranged in three parts, each part devoted to a particular play. Part I concerns *The Enterlude of Godly Queene Hester* (first performed in 1529–1530). Goodblatt maintains that this early Tudor play, in retelling the story of Esther, raises questions about women’s place in an androcentric monarchy. In particular, the play addresses “the Queen’s relations with family and religion/nation” and interrogates “the function and boundaries of a woman’s authority” (29). “Played out within the context of family and monarch . . . this narrative struggles (both in the biblical and dramatic texts) with various issues,” including the questions of how “knowledge is revealed and implemented, law and justice are stabilized, and identity as both woman and God’s chosen (Jew, Christian) is questioned and (somewhat) defined” (70).

Part II, devoted to *The Historie of Jacob and Esau*, first performed at the end of Edward VI's reign (1552–53), opens with a discussion of a key moment in both the biblical narrative and the play when Rebekah, pregnant with twins, “went to inquire of the Lord. And the Lord said to her ... ‘Two nations are in your womb, / And two peoples from your inward parts shall be separated. / And one people will be stronger than the other people, / And the older will serve the younger’” (Genesis 25:22–23, Goodblatt's translation). This textual crux was much debated both by rabbinic and Christian exegetes: did Rebekah engage the Almighty directly or was the divine message mediated by a male figure (perhaps Abraham)? According to Goodblatt, Rebekah's agency is a central issue of the play. In this reading, while certain male characters resist the matriarch's assertion of agency, Rebekah asserts her direct, unmediated communication with Almighty. “[T]he Lorde spake not these wordes to me in vaine,” she declares (78). The play reveals “continued attempts, both by the Poet in his prologue and the characters within the play, to divest authority from Rebecca's [Rebekah's] prayers and her knowledge of divine revelation” (88). The argument that various characters undermine Rebekah's initiative is compelling, but not incontrovertible, as the conclusion depends in part on which biblical text one chooses to read alongside the dramatic text. As discussed below, if one selects a different text or context, a different interpretation may result. Other topics addressed in this section include the doctrine of divine election, “the legitimacy of divine and familial law,” and the play's political allegory (Esau as English Catholics; Jacob as the Protestant elect) (122).

Part III turns to George Peele's political and “juridical parable,” *The Love of King David and Fair Bethsabe, with the Tragedie of Absalon*, published in 1599. Goodblatt asserts “the strong intertextuality between [the play] and literary genres of the Bible, as well as between the play and contemporaneous French biblical poetry and drama” (176). The play echoes contemporary issues related to “the Elizabethan family and monarchy,” which Goodblatt finds addressed in the retelling of two parables of “judgment and justice”—Nathan's parable of the rich man who seized the poor man's ewe lamb (2 Samuel 12) and the parable of the Tekoite woman (2 Samuel 14) (176). In the playwright's treatment of these and other biblical episodes, “Peele exploits the

narrative of the Davidic monarchy to transform biblical voices into echoes of contemporaneous English affairs" (176).

If a text is a tissue of past citations, if there is always language before and around the text as Kristeva and Barthes argue, if the text always bears the traces of (or is "haunted" by) prior and neighboring texts, then *Jewish and Christian Voices in English Reformation Biblical Drama* stands on firm ground when it locates meaning in the dialogue of antecedent and contemporaneous citations, sources, and analogues. However, given "the virtual cornucopia" of available literary and exegetical texts, contexts, and literary traditions (160), it is fair to ask when reading intertextually: why this particular "voice," source, or analogue, but not another? This is especially challenging when selecting one Bible translation among the many circulating in the Tudor period. If translation is in fact an act of interpretation, as Goodblatt notes (citing Roland H. Bainton's dictum "translation was itself exegesis"), then one might wonder why the study gives space to the Catholic Douay-Rheims translation, unfriendly towards Protestantism through its glosses attacking Protestant heresies. Is this translation as relevant to aims of the playwright or the biases of a Protestant audience as the Geneva Bible or other Bibles in the Tyndale-to-KJV lineage?

There may be reasons to ignore the Authorized Version (KJV—King James Version), but its exclusion ought to be explained. One could argue that the KJV arrived too late for consideration, appearing anachronistically in 1611 after the plays had been published, yet Goodblatt's intertextual method relies on various works and historical events that come after the publication of the plays. Furthermore, the Douay-Rheims Old Testament, which the author does employ (published in 1609–1610), is no less "anachronistic" than the KJV. Furthermore, the KJV, deeply dependent upon earlier Protestant Bibles (about 60% of its language borrowed directly from Tyndale tradition of Bibles), seems a particularly apt work for intertextual analysis. Goodblatt's hermeneutical method means casting a wide net to encompass works and events that follow the composition or early performance of the plays. It is hard to account for the study's omission of the most influential of all English Bibles.

Even after the selection of a Bible translation is settled, another question looms: which passage(s) from the selected translation are

relevant to the intertextual exercise? The Bible contains a massive array of materials, diverse genres, competing narratives, teachings, and even theologies. The passage(s) selected for reading in tandem with the play is inherently interested. Should the intertextual reading rely on a single verse (a kind of “prooftexting”), a full pericope, or a much larger selection from the sacred text? When both the Old and the New Testaments treat the same narrative, should the Christian (re) interpretation—the New Testament “midrash”—be privileged, given the Christian orientation of the playwright and English audience?

A case in point can be seen when deciding how to read *The Historie of Jacob and Esau*. The Jacob and Esau story functions in a particular way in the New Testament. St. Paul’s discourse in Romans 9–11 led Reformed commentators to see the Genesis story as a dramatic illustration of divine initiative and predestination. The Geneva Bible (1640), with its explanatory glosses on Genesis, Romans, and the Book of Hebrews, underscored a Calvinist understanding of divine sovereignty, unconditional election, and so forth. This translation, massively popular in the sixteenth century, provided the tools by which the ordinary lay person made sense of the Bible. It is not too much to say that this Bible shaped the very consciousness of the age. While Goodblatt does cite the Geneva Bible and briefly notes the presence of Calvinist theology (97), the analysis largely misses the Pauline-Protestant-Calvinist cast to the Jacob-and-Esau plot made clear by the Pauline discourse in Romans 9–11.

To read *Jacob and Esau* as being primarily “about” human agency is to miss another, perhaps more historically plausible reading, namely, that the play affirms divine election over human freedom. Seen through the lens of St. Paul as rendered in the Geneva Bible, the play proves to be about the divine, not the human, will (Romans 9:16). It is the Creator, not a human actor, who *chooses* Jacob over Esau. St. Paul quotes the book of Genesis to make the point clear. God says to Moses: “I wil have mercie on him, to whome I will shewe mercie: and wil have compassion on him, on whome I will have compassion” (Romans 9:15; Exodus 33:19). The Geneva Bible gloss on Romans 9:7 underscores the point that the deity prefers Jacob over Esau. Jacob’s election is not due to human merit or maternal cleverness. Rather, the outcome flows from “the secret election of God”: “The Israelites

must not be esteemed by their kinred, but by the secret election of God, which is above the external vocation.” Accordingly, Jacob is not “blurring Rebecca’s immediate authority” (80), but trying to be a good (Calvinist) believer. Goodblatt argues that Rebekah subverts patriarchy, but in the Pauline-Calvinist-Geneva Bible rendering the true subverter is the Almighty, not a mortal. Rebekah *receives* the divine news that the elder son will serve the younger; she witnesses the Providential plan and may be seen as the instrument in effecting the subversion of masculinist structures. The irony runs deep. A profoundly patriarchal deity undermines patriarchy and the law of primogeniture with the assistance of a woman.

The intertextual enterprise raises multiple challenges. The sheer quantity of “voices” is daunting, virtually limitless. What *isn’t* a potential context for these three dramas, especially when the menu of possibilities includes works written after, and events that transpired after, the plays’ composition? The decision to follow one textual echo while leaving another one behind can seem arbitrary. Paying little attention to the popular Geneva Bible (which underwent more than a hundred printings between 1560 and 1611) and completely ignoring the King James Version should at least be explained. How much attention should a text receive that was unknown and unavailable to the playwright or early audience? Should a precursor or contemporaneous text or event carry more interpretive weight than a work written or an event that occurred after the play’s composition?

Despite these questions, Goodblatt’s argument that English religious drama of the sixteenth century, the Bible, and other exegetical texts are mutually illuminating is compelling. In assembling an array of “voices,” especially lesser known Jewish works, Goodblatt implicitly invites listeners to hear something new and interesting in the “imperfectly audible” conversations activated by these plays, “records of lost engagements” (as Greg Walker, author of *Reading Literature Historically*, expressed it). The book serves as a summons to join the colloquy. Chaucer’s Host in the *Canterbury Tales*, after hearing the Knight’s opening tale, comes to mind when he enthusiastically declared: “*unbokeled is the male.*” No doubt others will join Goodblatt in discovering additional Jewish and Christian voices that resonate in English Reformation biblical drama.

Caspar Barlaeus. *The Wise Merchant*. Ed. with intro. by Anna-Luna Post. Tr. with notes by Corinna Vermeulen. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2019. 134 pp. + 7 illus. €29.99/\$37.50. Review by MICHAEL J. REDMOND, UNIVERSITY OF PALERMO.

As an oration presented at the inauguration of the Athenaeum Illustre, a precursor of the University of Amsterdam, the *Mercator sapiens, sive oratio de conjungendis mercaturae et philosophiae studiis* is notable in the context of Renaissance humanist writing for its unique effort to link the tangible profits of commerce with the more abstruse benefits of classical study. For Caspar Barlaeus, keen to gain the support of the city's financial elite for the new educational institution, the wise merchant needs to recognize "the importance of literature and the humanities in conducting trade" (111). The appeal of such rhetoric to the local audience, as Anna-Luna Post sets out in her incisive critical introduction, ensured that the oration was rushed into print soon after it was presented in January 1632, and it continued to circulate extensively throughout the seventeenth century in both Latin editions and Dutch translations. The concern with the cultural formation of traders makes the oration an outlier even in the exceptionally varied literary and academic career of Barlaeus, a Dutch polymath who had constantly reinvented himself as a minister, professor of philosophy, doctor, poet, and private tutor. There is no doubt, as Post shows, that Barlaeus had significant motivations for seeking the favor of Amsterdam's merchants. The successful launch of the Athenaeum Illustre allowed Barlaeus to return to a prestigious academic position after being excluded from his professorship during the Counter-Reonstrant repression thirteen years earlier. The astute rhetoric of Barlaeus has retained its allure in recent historical studies of the Dutch Golden Age, where fleeting references to the now archetypal figure of the wise merchant serve to epitomize all the economic and cultural aspirations of the period.

It is easy to read the representation of classical humanism in the *Mercator sapiens* in transactional terms. After establishing the need for a more accessible critical edition, Post's introduction surveys the

life and career of Barlaeus, the origins of the Athenaeum Illustre, and concludes with a substantial discussion of the oration. The problematic legal status of the Athenaeum Illustre, set up in de facto competition to the exclusive privileges of the University of Leiden, underlines that there was a very real need for Barlaeus to present a convincing business case for a school that was precluded from offering academic degrees. Alongside the complaints coming from Leiden, seeking to frustrate the challenge to its monopoly on Dutch higher education, there were significant doubts about the viability of Amsterdam's "lesson market" (38). For Barlaeus and Gerard Vossius, the other professor hired to launch the school, the risks of moving to a fledgling institution in a city without an academic tradition were compensated by the well-paid opportunity they had been offered to escape previous career obstacles arising from their Remonstrant sympathies. After being fired from his position as Professor of Logic at Leiden, Barlaeus had attempted to retrain as a medical doctor before going on to make a living as a private tutor and panegyric poet. Consequently, taking into account the market conditions in Amsterdam, both Barlaeus and Vossius took great care to promote the practical utility of learning, choose attractive lecture topics, and schedule the activities of the Athenaeum Illustre at convenient times for the city's merchants. Much of Barlaeus' inaugural oration focuses on the specific economic benefits of individual fields of study, illustrated by frequent allusions to the works of Aristotle and other familiar figures. The focus here is on how "the human faculty for trade and that for philosophy work together in the best of ways," rather than any innate value of scholarship (77). Appealing to the self-interest of the merchant class, Barlaeus represents classical humanism as a lucrative source of inside information on the guiding principles of human relationships and the natural world. The foregone conclusion of his catalogue of ancient knowledge, consistent with his pledge that the classically educated trader "is able to handle himself better in any business," is that "the wealthiest cities cannot do without schools, teachers, libraries and the instruments of wisdom" (113).

Yet what stands out in this new edition of the *Mercator sapiens*, presenting an English translation for the first time in parallel with the Latin text, is the extent to which Barlaeus openly concedes that his panegyric of the profit motive is only "an enticing bait" for his busi-

ness minded audience (77). For although making such an evocative text available to a wider scholarly readership is important in and of itself, given the oration's potential value for studies of early modern mercantile culture, Post's introduction also provides a necessary correction to more superficial citations of the figure of the wise merchant in recent historical research. By neglecting the rhetorical complexity of the oration's apparent commercialization of knowledge, Post argues, "Like Barlaeus' audience, historians have been frequently reeled in by this bait" (16). Instead, even as he self-consciously exploits the mindset of "a city devoted to financial gain," Barlaeus redefines the profit of scholarship in terms of the overriding importance of pure wisdom (77). Significantly, as part of its bait and switch strategy, the oration concludes by enjoining the young students of the school to "not think it splendid to have the shine of silver or gold around you, but to shine with the light of learning" (123).

This critical edition succeeds in providing us with a fuller understanding of the *Mercator sapiens*. Along with the substantial introduction, extending more than fifty pages, there is a brief account by Corinna Vermeulen of the principles guiding the presentation of the Latin text and the style of the English translation. The prefatory material is supplemented with attractive period illustrations depicting the life of Barlaeus, the publication of the oration, and the founding of the Athenaeum Illustre. A short bibliography and index conclude the volume. The editorial contributions also include useful footnotes, keyed to the lines of the facing English text, that make manifest the dense network of classical allusions deployed by Barlaeus. While some scholars may lament the absence of any discussion of potential alternative renderings of specific Latin terms and phrases in these notes, the English translation is a viable starting point for future studies of the oration. In the case of the facing Latin text, Vermeulen has opted to modernize the punctuation of the original 1632 edition and introduce new paragraph separations to highlight its overall rhetorical structure. It is clear that great efforts have been made here to produce an accessible edition for today's readers, even though some of the English phrasing can leave an awkward impression on occasion.

All in all, this is a welcome volume that may encourage greater interest in the *Mercator sapiens* from a wider range of early modern-

ists, given the influence of Dutch merchants in many diverse European historical spheres. In this light, it is especially laudable that the publisher of the volume has made the text freely available in pdf form from the University of Amsterdam Press website via a Creative Commons license.

Erik R. Seeman. *Speaking with the Dead in Early America*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2019. ix + 329 pp. + 25 illus. \$39.95. Review by WILLIAM J. SCHEICK, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

Death is perfectly natural; life after death is perfectly unnatural. The former is utterly observable, whereas the latter remains remotely imperceptible. Neither fact, however, has prevented deep human sentiment from enthusiastically affirming the reality of an afterlife as well as imagining that state as a perfected version of corporeal existence. Over time, various religious beliefs (both official and unofficial) have morphed in one way or another to accommodate the mind's ego-driven longing to live forever.

It is easy enough to take on faith what is already profoundly desired. Even so, who among believers in an afterlife would not welcome some inkling of verification, especially coming from deceased loved ones bearing good news? This question pervades Erik R. Seeman's readable, thoughtful, and evenhanded *Speaking with the Dead in Early America*. Seeman finds that early American reports of ghostly apparitions during the first half of the seventeenth century reveal a widespread belief in a permeable boundary between this world and the next.

Sometimes, in fact, seventeenth-century friends or relatives made pacts, with each person promising a postmortem contact with the remaining, living member. Various personal narratives recorded the fulfillment of such promises—comforting, not scary accounts. Of course, Protestant clergy expressed skepticism. Wary of Roman Catholic taint in reports of ghostly apparitions, they insisted that no tormented souls ever wandered from purgatory, which did not exist. Church leaders fretted over whether apparitional encounters were merely imagined by the bereaved or, perhaps, were dangerous delu-

sions spawned by fallen angels.

And yet even Increase Mather believed a London mother's testimony. In *Cases of Conscience Concerning Evil Spirits* (1693), he concluded that in rare instances "Persons after their Death [do] appear unto the Living." His son Cotton Mather likewise credited a Boston man's account of a deceased murdered brother's transatlantic apparition and deduced, in *Wonders of the Invisible World* (1693), that "the spectre, it seems, took the same time, that the Sun takes, to pass over the Degrees of Longitude, into America." However reluctant their concessions might have been, New England ministers acknowledged that sometimes, albeit seldomly, spirits of the dead could briefly return from the supernatural world. The very notion of this undisputed, yet unknowable, realm of departed souls left ample room for inexplicable experiences such as ghostly visitations.

Less direct, and far more sanctioned, interaction with the dead informed New England funeral poetry. Such occasional verse, brought to and read at burial sites, served as an acceptable medium for the bereaved to speak to and hear from the deceased. These works displayed emotional anticipations of heavenly reunions—a theme that has been (Seeman maintains) mistakenly thought to originate during the second half of the eighteenth century. A century earlier, in fact, Anne Bradstreet engaged this theme in elegies she penned during the 1660s. Moreover, "in New England, Increase and Cotton Mather led the ministerial turn toward greater attention to heavenly reunions."

The rise of "talking gravestones" (in Seeman's phrasing) paralleled a shift in the early eighteenth century from an older Calvinist emphasis on the beatific vision as the saints' heavenly reward to a more humanly comforting hope for a postmortem reunion of loved ones. Gravestones, like elegies, provided another form of communication between the living and the dead. At first, New England graves went unmarked; later, wooden markers were utilized. Gravestones, with winged skulls and folk icons, appeared during the 1670s, when funeral customs became more elaborate. Similar to elegies, engraved epitaphs both addressed and spoke for the deceased. Over time, these enduring gravestones became religious objects possessing a form of agency bordering close to, but remaining distinct from, the forbidden territory of Roman Catholic material culture.

A still greater degree of ambiguity informed eighteenth-century print culture, which featured a dynamic interplay between belief and skepticism about ghosts. Various writings could be considered true relations or mere entertainment—an uncertainty that allowed for multiple reader responses unified only by an abiding curiosity about the afterlife. Here, Seeman finds, lies a wellspring for the nineteenth-century “cult of the dead, a religious complex that in the early nineteenth century emerged from Protestantism but contained lay- and especially female-driven elements distinct from mainstream Protestantism.”

Thomas Keymer. *Poetics of the Pillory: English Literature and Seditious Libel, 1660–1820*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2019. xviii + 323 pp. + 31 illus. \$35. Review by NIALL ALLSOPP, UNIVERSITY OF EXETER.

Thomas Keymer’s excellent new book is a combined history and critical study of the ways in which conditions of censorship shaped English literature during the long eighteenth century (1660–1820). The book began life as the Clarendon Lectures given at the University of Oxford in 2014–15; these have been expanded with rich archival and critical detail, without sacrificing the energy and lucidity of the lectures (including retaining the use of contractions).

Keymer’s central claim is that indirect censorship via the threat of post-publication retribution proved “a crucial determinant of eighteenth-century authorship” (21). The pillory, memorably described by Daniel Defoe as the “hieroglyphic state machine,” was in reality neither so “wholly indecipherable” as a hieroglyph (7), nor so relentlessly systematic as a machine. Keymer is at pains to warn us against a “totalitarian fallacy” (13), specifically fingered as “Foucauldian” (7), which imagines censorship as a monolithic or coherently-articulated structure. The pillory was a piece of street theatre, a spectacle of “publike terror” (12), which sometimes became an occasion for mob violence, but which could also be converted by its wilier victims into a “festival of defiance” (5). And it was only one component in a larger web of retributive tactics including “extra-legal harassment” and “sleazy

pecuniary methods” meant to intimidate and deter seditious writers (20). Retribution was applied in an “arbitrary and alarmingly unpredictable” fashion (23)—Keymer highlights one pamphleteer, William Jones, whom the government awarded a knighthood for his services while simultaneously prosecuting for his “seditious, treasonable, and diabolical” writings (14). The climate of anxiety and uncertainty created by this regime, Keymer contends, provided an “enabling discipline” (22) which spurred writers to brilliant heights of technical skill in developing strategies of “irony, indirection, and encoding,” or as Jonathan Swift put it, writing “with Caution and double Meaning, to prevent Prosecution” (24).

Seventeenth-century specialists will recognize in Keymer’s argument the influence of Annabel Patterson’s classic study *Censorship and Interpretation*, first published in 1984. Patterson argued that practices of complexity and polyvalence, which we think of as hallmarks of literary writing, evolved in the seventeenth century as what she called “functional ambiguity,” methods for circumventing censorship. While acknowledging the sustained critique that has challenged and refined Patterson’s thesis, Keymer adapts and applies it, seeking to bridge from the English civil wars, across the eighteenth century, into the Romantic period, where parallel arguments about seditious speech have been developed by scholars like John Barrell and Jon Mee. Throughout this period, Keymer argues, the threat of retribution produced an “internalized check” (19) of self-censorship, but also enabled new kinds of literary skill. These techniques, in turn, required a new kind of discipline on the part of readers, which Keymer describes with a phrase borrowed from Paul Ricoeur: a “hermeneutics of suspicion.” This involved a “suspicion of surface meaning,” analogous to the frame of mind with which official prosecutors were presumably scrutinizing questionable writings, a constant “vigilance” towards possibly “criminal subtexts” (25). Many writers felt this hyper-attentive state resulted in better readers—Keymer has some fun by citing such unlikely bedfellows as Roger L’Estrange and William Blake unwittingly agreeing with one another that a good “Train of Mystery and Circumlocution” is “fittest for Instruction, because it rouzes the faculties to act” (25).

Keymer’s periodization is not simply a function of tradition or convenience, but a central plank of his argument—showing the

continuity of concerns with censorship throughout this period. He debunks the long-lived assumption, still prevalent in works like Geoff Kemp and Jason McElligott's landmark anthology *Censorship and the Press, 1580–1720*, that the lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695 marked a sea-change in British censorship. Instead, Keymer highlights the continuing attempts to reassert punitive press controls successfully in cases like the Succession to the Crown Act of 1707 or the Stage Licensing Act of 1737, and through the expansion in post-publication prosecution for seditious libel. Because seditious libel resided in common law rather than statute, the new regime could be considered tougher than the old Licensing Act, offering greater latitude to censors, and hence greater hazard to authors. The concept of seditious libel was nebulous—dangerously or productively so, depending on one's point of view. Its true significance, Keymer contends, can be glimpsed in the facility with which it bled into the neighbouring categories of blasphemous and above all obscene libel. Sedition was elder cousin to sodomy, which together with the other crimes punishable by pillory, including blasphemy and fraud, represented the “violation or perversion of officially sanctioned norms” (8).

Centred though it is around the eighteenth century, the book contains much to interest a seventeenth-century specialist. Keymer's starting point, perhaps the best-known literary pillorying of all, took place in 1637: William Prynne's ears severed, nose slit, and skin branded, at the hands of Archbishop Laud. Although, as Keymer notes, the gruesomeness of that occasion was in fact surpassed by the mutilation of James Naylor under Cromwell in 1656, it was Prynne who set the pattern that echoed throughout the ensuing century and a half. What had been planned as a “spectacle of exemplary punishment” was met by Prynne with a display of brave resistance, if self-serving then forgivably so under the circumstances. Notwithstanding his loathing of theatre, Keymer suggests, Prynne grasped the inherent theatricality of the pillory, which he transformed into the stage of his own martyrdom. The Earl of Clarendon, writing with hindsight, recognized that the affair proved counterproductive and “treasured up wrath for the time to come” (12). Men more radical than Prynne were galvanized by his fate—John Milton felt himself “pluck'd ... by the ears.” Milton was spared retribution when Clarendon was swept

to power in 1660—in an effort, Keymer suggests, to avoid repeating the mistake made with Prynne (he might have added that, by this time, Prynne had wholly reconciled with the monarchy). If the regime was keen to avoid reliving the Prynne affair, the event still played out repeatedly in literary memory. It resurfaces famously in Pope's *Dunciad*, applied to an even more slippery literary troublemaker: "Earless on high, stood un-abash'd Defoe." As Keymer's deft reading shows, Pope's six words manage to insult Defoe in multiple ways: the implied comparison with Prynne; both mutilated and senseless; "earless" rather than "fearless"; instead of the more properly Miltonic "undaunted," merely "un-abash'd" (101). The memory of Prynne shows how the pillory functioned as a productive literary symbol, in Pope's case, of retribution and abashment, but in Defoe's case, a centre of festive resistance. Defoe wrote a song to accompany his own pillorying in 1703, the *Hymn to the Pillory*, which was printed and distributed to the crowd (though Keymer pours cold water on the legend that they also festooned him with flowers).

Keymer's sole chapter devoted to seventeenth-century matters is rich and suggestive. We meet only briefly with Milton (Keymer refrains from adding much to the literature on *Areopagitica*, suggesting that it properly belongs to the earlier era of pre-publication licensing, rather than post-publication retribution). Andrew Marvell, Edmund Waller, and Aphra Behn, among others, are met with in passing. The central focus is on John Dryden, a choice not so counterintuitive as it may initially seem. Dryden was acquainted with the prosecutorial side of press censorship through his long alliance with his fellow Tory propagandist L'Estrange. But he was also on the receiving end of an act of post-publication retribution, albeit of an unofficial kind, a nocturnal cudgelling in Rose Alley in 1679, and was regularly in fear of more—"I hope the only thing I feard in it, is not found out," he noted of a later work (37).

Keymer contends that some of Dryden's greatest poetry was written in "moments of uncertainty and hazard" (37). In a curious way this undersells the chapter, which shines brightly on poems which are assuredly not among Dryden's greatest. "Upon the Death of Hastings" was the eighteen-year-old Dryden's contribution to a volume, *Lachrymae Musarum*, in which a glittering collection of poets including John

Denham, Robert Herrick, and Andrew Marvell attempted unconvincingly to cloak their outrage at the regicide behind a confection of grief at a minor nobleman's death from smallpox. Keymer reads Dryden's effort as a competitive exercise in the "art of political encoding," in which he takes on and actually surpasses his more senior rivals in "communicating dissonant meaning within a framework of permissible or deniable utterance" (43). It is practically the first time I have seen a convincing case for this as, if not quite a good, then at least an interesting poem, on literary rather than merely biographical grounds. It also reveals to us a shiftier, riskier Dryden who went on to write one of the greatest but shiftest poems of all, *Mac Flecknoe*. Keymer reads *Mac Flecknoe* memorably as a kind of "holiday from allegiance ... as though Dryden had written a Whig poem in his sleep" (62). I found this line of argument strikingly complementary to John West's book *Dryden and Enthusiasm* (also from Oxford University Press, but missing from Keymer's bibliography, presumably because it was published only shortly beforehand). Both Keymer and West quote Samuel Johnson describing a Dryden who "delighted to tread upon the brink of meaning" (49), producing a dangerous poet who could contain both the histrionic adulation of Stuart monarchy, and the radical energies of dissent. Future scholars hoping to understand Dryden's dynamic and contradictory attitudes, as well as his prodigious skill, will need to read West and Keymer's work carefully in conjunction.

Subsequent chapters carve up the period from 1700 to 1820 into roughly equal chunks. Each draws on a wide and colourful range of print and manuscript sources to trace both the workings and representation of the pillory, while maintaining a thread of close critical analysis of central literary figures in the assigned years—Pope and Defoe for the early eighteenth century, Johnson and Henry Fielding for the middle years, and Robert Southey for the Romantic period. The book concludes in 1820, when outspokenly revolutionary poems like Percy Shelley's *The Maske of Anarchy* appeared, if still facing "discernible legal inhibition," nevertheless enabled by a "decisive shift in the borderlines of what could be uttered," which offered "if not immunity, a degree of security" (285). Keymer concedes that a whiggish story about the gradual decline of censorship is "impossible to avoid" (18). However, he significantly revises the whiggish story by demonstrating

that the liberation of the press did not result from a sudden discovery of Enlightened tolerance among the ruling elites, but rather from the sheer practical difficulty of containing an “exuberant, diverse, endlessly innovative print culture” (21). This rather consoling conclusion may have political relevance today.

Brent S. Sirota and Allan I. Macinnes, eds. *The Hanoverian Succession in Great Britain and its Empire*. Woodbridge, Suffolk, United Kingdom: The Boydell Press, 2019. x + 222 pp. \$115. Review by CHRISTOPHER N. FRITSCH.

Understanding past events is often difficult. The aftermath of the Glorious Revolution, specifically the Protestant Succession, is a good example of a complex problem. Studies of the Revolution of 1688 and its aftermath are often very diverse and just as complex. The editors, Brent Sirota and Allan Macinnes, argue that the arrival of William and Mary was far less important than the changes that ensued. They see an “evolving politics” of individuals, groups, organizations, and nations. For the authors of this volume, Great Britain was anything but stable and on a sure footing in the wake of the Revolution of 1688.

The essays, then, reflect the multitude of changes within “four nations,” the overseas ventures of Great Britain and Scotland, and their intellectual, commercial, and diplomatic relations with the Continent. These include controversies arising from the last Stuart monarchs and political moves to consolidate both the Protestant Succession and the power of Parliament. At a certain level, each of the essays provides insight into the plethora of arguments and debates as responses to the events of 1688 and those since the revolution. These include controversies arising from the reign of the last Stuart monarchs. This leads to a discussion of the continuing existence of a Catholic Stuart line and their Jacobite and French Catholic support. Larger questions of continental and imperial conflict follow, leading to more theoretical issues involving the impact of industrialism and the Enlightenment.

Contradicting J. H. Plumb’s standard work, *The Growth of Political Stability in England* (1967), Daniel Szechi begins by positing a Britain that was highly Tory and hence unstable due to the Hanoverian Succession.

sion. Celebrating George I's succession in Buckinghamshire, wealthy, land owning Whigs built a bonfire to commemorate this accession and their own ascendancy, while middling and lower sorts poked fun at the king by depicting him as a turnip. Szechi argues that the succession produced a Whig ascendancy, though whether a stable one or not is in question. Scottish opposition to English designs accompanied strong Tory criticism of the monarch. George I continued to be assisted by the Whigs in the advancement of his Hanoverian goals. Thus, as supporters of the Crown, Whigs became more like traditional Tories.

Next we find Christopher Dudley's argument based upon solid qualitative and quantitative evidence. Through his analysis of specific shires and voting patterns from the elections of 1710, 1713, and 1715, Dudley concludes that there was no great shift in pro-Whig voting. He argues that, although Whigs increasingly lost the clergy and gentry as voters, English voters in the 1715 elected Whigs for one good reason—voters agreed with the Whig version of the 1688 Revolution. The Glorious Revolution became a familiar topic, compared to elections during the reign of Queen Anne. The Whigs successfully connected the potential goals of the Glorious Revolution to the frailty of the succession in a more meaningful way than their Tory counterparts. The fulfilment of the 1688 Revolution depended upon the Hanoverian succession, and this resonated with voters in the English shires under examination in Dudley's essay. Therefore, the election of 1715 was not an altogether new or more stable politics, regarding the Hanoverian succession, but reflected "a shift in the balance of power within the existing politics" (38).

Instability in Britain was partly due to the clergy. The Church of England and its clerics, as well as the non-conforming clergy, represented issues at the heart of political, social, and religious debate throughout the seventeenth century. The crucial moments in the early eighteenth century, including the Act of Settlement, the Act of Union, and the subsequent Hanoverian succession and conflict with Scotland, all held political, as well as religious components.

In "The Backlash Against Anglican Catholicity, 1709–18," Brent Sirota argues that at the advent of George I, the Church of England moved to end its Roman Catholic ties. The Church's whiggish members moved from the opposition in 1688–1689 to the inner circle

of power and assumed “the mantle of Anglican royalism” (61), by supporting George I and the succession. However, this threatened to further divide the Church between extremes of high Anglican orthodoxy and an ever growing development of theological pluralism. Whig churchmen positioned themselves as opponents of Anglican orthodoxy and its predisposition toward Catholicity, which often meant strained relations within the Church of England, as some clerics remained orthodox and conservative, while their bishops moved the church to a more whiggish position. All of this was fueled by George I, as he supported Whig supremacy and represented a non-Anglican theological position. English religious and political problems increased due to the recent War of Spanish Succession, which did much to dislocate Germans from their homes and bring them to England and, eventually for many, to the colonies in America.

What impact did the polarization have upon the subsequent life of the Church of England? Like Dudley, Sirota sees a world that is perhaps more shifting, than new. He addresses a church filled with historical identity problems that always entwined with the politics of monarchy. By 1715, the church faced a greater threat to their establishment. The seventeenth century saw the growth of non-conformity and sectarianism and the increasing scientific and philosophical moment, which threatened the foundations religious beliefs and church establishment.

These shifts forced the church to practice greater toleration for religious practices and thought. Conservative Anglican clergy opposed societal change and the bishops, who moved the Church away from establishment toward an allowance for private conscience, and, in the long run, disestablishment. The established Church of England, less dogmatic than the Laudian church a century before, prompted Whiggish churchmen to disconnect from the political and religious conservative Catholicity at one end and the more eroding demands of non-conformity, sectarianism, and personal conscience. This became more difficult with the advent of evangelicalism on the one side and an increasing movement that displaced God in favor of deism. Thus, for Sirota, the Hanoverian church was hardly a place to find stability.

If Whig churchmen found themselves caught in the middle and at odds with the political and religious extremes of their day, the essay by James Caudle continues this conversation. Like previous authors, the

past continued to be a point of contention. Caudle sees a potential end to the questions and demands surrounding the Glorious Revolution, but in many ways, the sermons depict an incomplete and unfulfilled revolution. The political sermons of 1714 “frequently connected the perceived core policies of the Glorious Revolution in civil rights and civil liberties to the policies expected to be brought in by the House of Hanover and the new branch of the Protestant Succession” (83). Clergy were, as Caudle presents, much more historical in their approach. They linked the Gunpowder Plot, the Glorious Revolution, the national deliverance from Jacobitism, and the Scottish rebellion of 1715 to the Hanoverian Succession. Connecting these events to the Hanoverian Succession was critical in securing 1688 goals. Caudle shows that Whigs and many Tory members within the church and the government were relieved by the Revolution and the succession. Not unlike Elizabeth’s England, Providence again saved Britain from all things Catholic, and this victory allowed the advance of civil rights and freedom of conscience.

However, the victory was more than just the Protestant providentialism that removed a Catholic political and religious threat. The decades before the Hanoverian Succession saw a financial revolution. Abigail Swingen recounts the works of John Toland and Joseph Addison as they connected the 1689 constitutional settlement with Britain’s economy. For Joseph Addison, the Jacobite restoration was detrimental to a Protestant nation, religiously and politically, but also economically (101)

Swingen, like Szechi, targets Plumb’s stability thesis and the perception that a large consensus existed on the efficacy of the financial revolution. Swingen argues that many did not endorse the policies of national debt and public credit, and the emerging world of financial wealth, as opposed to the more traditional form of landed wealth. Jacobite repudiation of debts, though, not only attacked Britain economic ideas and interests, but also attacked the nation’s religious and political settlements after 1689.

The first five chapters show an unstable England. How did the tumultuous events of Revolution or Succession impact regions beyond England? In Megan Cherry’s essay on colonial policy toward North America between 1688 and 1715, she argues that Britain became

more staunchly anti-Catholic. Beyond this, Whigs and Tories held opposing views of the role of colonies. Whigs believed that colonies would provide raw materials and finished goods, and consume goods from around the Atlantic and the world. Whigs saw the creation of a world-wide trading network that united colonies to the United Kingdom. Thus, they pursued the settlement and development of colonies, the production of naval stores, and the consumption of goods. Tories maintained a more conservative plan that relied less on colonial development and more on “monopolistic trading companies” and the re-export trade. In the end, Cherry argues, neither the Glorious Revolution nor the Hanoverian Succession made much impact upon colonial policy. What changed regarding the colonies in North America was the Whig ascendancy.

The impact of Succession is more difficult to see in Scotland. Allan Macinnes argues that “There was no straight correlation between English and Scottish politicians” after the Revolution (137). Externally, England saw Scotland as a backdoor to the rest of the island. Internally, Scotland was fractured in a number of political and religious ways. Macinnes argues that Scotland became “comfortable with the Hanoverian Succession” (137), only with the accession of George II. This occurred after the creation of what Macinnes calls “an alternative patriotism to that of the Whig Supremacy or of Scottish Jacobitism” (137). This patriotism was an adherence to the Empire. As spokesman for imperial patriotism, Macinnes argues that Sir William Keith “contended that British subjects at home and abroad were bound together by rights and liberties applied equitably and without privileging one part of the state over another” (153). For Keith, patriotism had less to do with the politics of the nation and more to do with the rights and liberties espoused by the nation. If Keith was correct, so is Macinnes. Patriotism or loyalty changed in Scotland. The rebellion of 1715 may have come at a time when the outcome was questionable, but by 1745, Scots embraced the empire as the “Jacobites were unable to change the British government or restore the Stuarts” (154).

Patriotism, or loyalty, changed beyond Scotland. As the monarch and the Whigs violated British laws regarding the separation of British and Hanoverian foreign and military policy, for many, patriotism meant adherence to Whig Party policy. Steve Pincus and Amy Watson

do not address the kind of patriotism presented by Sir William Keith. Rather, Pincus and Watson explore the Patriots, a political group, who had broad impact in England, Scotland, and the colonies of North America. Originally Whigs before 1720, within a decade they aligned themselves with Tories. Within another decade, they created their own structure and ideology to become a distinct party (157). Patriots held the national interest above party, and broadened their membership by including disaffected Scots and extending their reach to the colonies. Pincus and Watson see the greatest impact by the Patriots upon the empire, as they believed that the empire was “a vital national interest” (174). Thus, they laid the foundation for British policy in the 1740s and 1750s, and perhaps how London saw North America in 1776.

Ideas did not always move from the British Isles to the rest of the world. Esther Mijers sees the movement of ideas from the continent via the United Provinces. The United Provinces continued as an intellectual conduit across the English Channel. For example, French Huguenots arrived in the Provinces, and with their movement to England brought French ideas and contacts. Mijers argues that these movements created the Republic of Letters, and encouraged men in Britain, such as Samuel Johnson, to develop an international climate for the transmission of ideas across the British Isles, the continent, and North America.

Finally, Robert Frost compares the monarchs of Hanover and Saxony and their respective reigns in the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth of Poland-Lithuania. Regarding the former, Frost argues that the Scottish rebellion of 1715 helped George I and the Whigs consolidate power and ended the anxiety of a Stuart return. Situating Frost's comments with previous essays, one can see the validity of his conclusion. Consolidating power and ending the Stuart threat did not prevent some Britons from believing that the Hanoverians placed the interests of the United Kingdom behind those of Hanover. These suspicions explain why Patriots, as written about by Pincus and Watson, placed the national interest above party. Hanoverian policies looked to unify British and Hanoverian interests, at the cost of British independence. Perceptions of policy increased conflict within the United Kingdom. As the Patriots wanted, the national interest grew in value in the United Kingdom and the continent became a secondary issue.

The real issue is, as developed by Daniel Szechi—was Britain really stable? These essays reject Plumb's thesis of stability. However, there is more. Perhaps, the authors of these essays should address the broader question of revolution and stability: the dynamics of revolution. For example, conservative elements within the Church of England regarded Charles and James Stuart as Roman Catholic, and thus a threat to the Church of England and Protestant England. They looked more conservative and anti-revolutionary in the light of 1715, as they appeared as pro-Stuart and pro-Catholic spokesmen. A more moderate and conciliating position captured the Church of England. The revolution—to paraphrase Crane Britton—moved a little more left, and trying to stop it made you more conservative. High Anglican clergy became more conservative in the aftermath of the Revolution. In the construction of a Protestant Britain, they saw a Church of England run by bishops and archbishops, who made concessions to non-conformists and sectarians, and endorsed personal conscience and choice to the point of recognizing deist ideas. Whiggish Anglicans searched for a middle course to consolidate power and maintain control, as they looked to define the Church of England within the existing extremes of Catholicity and deism and confront a growing threat from evangelicals. In countering those extremes, the Church continued this dynamic of revolution.

In the aftermath of the War of Spanish Succession, the War of Austrian Succession, and the Seven Years' War, Tories came to power. This change in party was no less connected to the past and no less confronted with problems, especially financial ones. These problems and responses led to another revolution—this time a transatlantic one involving Britain's North American colonies. Spokesmen in the colonies often connected historical moments, beginning with 1649 and moving toward 1776.

The stability under investigation within these essays connects to the nature and workings of revolution. Revolutions are, in themselves, destabilizing moments. This volume adequately recognizes the weaknesses of Plumb's stability. Each author discusses not the end of the revolution or revolutionary considerations, but the continuation of revolution. For the authors, the Glorious Revolution continued to be a part of the political conversation, and these conversations furthered

other revolutions and reactions. The Revolution of 1688, the rise of Parliament, the construction of Union, and defining succession were destabilizing events, creating new sets of winners and losers. Both groups found links to the past. This dynamic rejects stability, but demands greater research into revolution. Therefore, we are left questioning when the United Kingdom became stable, why it happened, and what forces constructed this more stable environment.

Todd Butler. *Literature and Political Intellection in Early Stuart England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019. xiii + 240 pp. \$77.00. Review by BRETT A. HUDSON, MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY.

In *Literature and Political Intellection in Early Stuart England*, Todd Butler re-examines the political tensions and the struggle for power between the monarchies of James I and Charles I and their judiciaries and Parliaments through the context of the seventeenth century's shifting understanding of private and public deliberation. Butler's journey through what he describes as intellectual prerogatives and liberties charts an intriguing path through confessionals, court rooms, chambers of Parliament, royal cabinets, and Edenic domiciles in order to illustrate the gradual democratization of decision making and interpretation during the seventeenth century. Butler's use of the term intellection is situated near the developing field of cognitive studies; however, he eschews a firm use of anatomical or scientific terms and instead chooses to focus on political intellection as "the various ways that early modern individuals sought to think through the often uncertain political and religious environment they occupied, and how attention to such thinking in oneself or others could itself constitute a political position" (6). In using this methodology, Butler reveals how intellection was not only a process by which political opinions and their subsequent actions were formed but also a process over which political battles were fought throughout the seventeenth century's Early Stuart period and beyond.

We are introduced to Early Stuart intellection in the context of the Gunpowder Plot. The fears and anxieties over treasonous thoughts and actions which followed the Gunpowder Plot animated debates over

religious conscience and motivated James I to find a coercive means of knowing, interpreting, and controlling the potentially radical thoughts of his subjects. By examining the polemical debates over the doctrine of equivocation, Butler shows how the Oath of Allegiance's meaning was tightly controlled by the monarchy's interpretive prerogatives, allowing James to combat the intellectual liberties and communicative ambiguities created by the doctrine of equivocation and to assert the process of meaning making as well as the private thought process which accompanies the act of interpretation solely as the jurisdiction of the king. Butler presents James as being mostly successful in framing intellection as a royal prerogative in his examination of John Donne's *Ignatius His Conclave* and *Pseudo-Martyr* as texts which defend the impenetrability and inscrutability of the king's mind and which support the wrenching away of mental reservation from English Catholics, forcing subjects to moderate their thoughts according to the king's understanding of language.

Shifting to less discussed topics, Butler goes on to examine James' battle over thought control in more corporate modes of thinking by charting the collapse of the 1614 Addled Parliament and analyzing debates over the independence of the judiciary in the context of intellectual rights and the right to private deliberation without the interference of the king. Of interest is how Butler points to the Parliament's systematizing of its operations and its consultation of its own records of proceedings to form a collective identity and memory to rival the monarchy's deliberative prerogatives. Noting the Addled Parliament's refusal to consider first the king's legislative agenda, Butler suggests the conflict between James and Parliament was intellectual as Parliament attempted to emancipate itself from a solely consultatory role which was traditionally subservient to the king's prerogative of decision making. Later, Butler points to the debates of legal jurisdiction between Edward Coke and Francis Bacon over the imprisonment and trial of the preacher Edmund Peacham to show again James' desire to intervene in deliberative processes, which allows Butler to exhibit Coke's *Institutes of the Laws of England* and his *Reports* as evidence of evolving seventeenth-century views of public debate and interpretation. Butler points to Coke's democratizing of the understanding and interpretation of the law through the act of publication as a catalyst

that would further divide king and Parliament.

Butler juxtaposes James' successes at maintaining private deliberation and meaning making as distinctively royal prerogatives against Charles' inability to rule England completely unaided by Parliament's deliberative agenda. Butler shows how in Charles' early Parliaments, political debates "moved beyond tactical and procedural particulars to engage more fundamental questions of individual rights and constitutional prerogatives, with matters of procedure and precedent—the very structure of Parliament's deliberations—becoming enmeshed with potential challenges to royal authority" (127). Particularly, Parliament's exercising of deliberative delay was an irritant to the king and an indicator of shifting power dynamics in Caroline England. Charles' tyrannically inclined solution was to prorogue Parliament while funding his wars through forced loans. To elucidate these events, Butler again looks to the evolving dynamics of public reception and the democratization of interpretation that exacerbated the political and intellectual tensions between king and Parliament. Butler examines publicly accessible texts such as Philip Massinger's play *The Roman Actor* and makes engaging observations on the play's defense of actors whose words might inspire moral or immoral thoughts and actions. The play argues that internal personal critique is "the result of successive stages of experience and deliberation, moral reformation thus occurring not immediately but through a succession of properly directed cognitive acts" and that places the agency of deliberation (and the burden of guilt in the cases of immoral thoughts) in the audience. In doing so, the play was modeling the political environment wherein the Commons sought out a space for deliberative delay as an "intellective bulwark against a potentially encroaching royal prerogative" (141).

Butler's analysis of Early Stuart political intellection culminates in the tumultuousness of the Civil Wars when Parliament utilized the captured correspondence of Charles and Henrietta Maria to alienate the king and the people. Central to Butler's analysis is print culture. Highlighting the use of print by both king and Parliament in polemical defenses and attacks, Butler contributes to the existing substantial body of scholarship dedicated to seventeenth-century print culture in order to show how print became an interpretive space where the public could enter and participate in the process of political intellec-

tion. Butler moves beyond the typical examination of newsbooks to private correspondence that is intercepted and subsequently read by unintended audiences. Butler's particular focus is on the captured correspondence of the king and queen referred to as the Naseby Letters, which were published as *The Kings Cabinet Opened* and which represented a substantial "expansion of the intellectual franchise" of Parliament and the wider reading public (168). The Naseby Letters illustrate the role reversal experienced by the monarchy in Early Stuart England. Where early in the century James successfully penetrated, exposed, and interpreted the minds of his subjects by means of trials and oath taking, Charles' mind had become the object of penetration, exposure, and subsequent interpretation. Butler reveals Charles' ineffectual attempts at aligning interpretive authority with authorial intent. Butler successfully echoes themes from earlier in the study, showing how Charles, like James, became embroiled in public debates over royal prerogatives to receive his own council as well as concerns of Catholic influence. The Naseby letters laid bare the intimate and wide-ranging discourse of Charles and the Catholic Queen Henrietta Maria for all to behold. However, Butler shows the extent to which royal prerogatives of intellection had become democratized by suggesting that Charles' defense of general intellectual privacy ultimately hinged on degrees of distinction rather than positing the king's private deliberations as inherently different.

In the final chapters, Butler pivots to discursive and deliberative domesticity. By placing the discursive intimacy of Charles and Henrietta Maria in the center of the battle over intellectual liberties, Butler is able to follow a line of analysis examining the gendering of political discourse during Charles' reign. Central to his analysis is Parliament's assertion that the queen was usurping its role as counselor to the king. Within the Parliament's attacks on Henrietta Maria as political interloper and the king's defense of the queen as domestic partner of the king, Butler sees echoes of Milton's divorce tracts, though their publication (as Butler points out) precedes the Naseby controversy by four months. Still, Butler presents Milton as illustrating "the immediate political currency of marital conversation during the 1640s" (193). Butler asserts that Milton "emphasize[s] masculine headship in ways more consonant with Parliament's presumptive position as

the primary, and resolutely masculine, source of deliberative authority within the nation" (178). Though the discussion of Milton's divorce tracts may seem anachronistic, Butler's insights, particularly in how the tracts thematically interact with concepts of marital discourse and deliberation, are very relevant to Butler's goal of charting the development of how individuals thought through decisions in the new and developing political spheres and spaces of the seventeenth century. Butler makes references to contemporaneous texts such as marriage handbooks, and the reader is left wondering what a closer analysis of such texts could reveal about the period's intellectual shifts. However, Butler continues to push the discussion of Charles and Henrietta Maria further away from the political moment of the Naseby letters and the royal marriage as he turns the attention of his study of political intellection directly on to Milton and gender when he begins his examination of *Paradise Lost*. Building upon the scholarship of Laura Knoppers, Diane Purkiss, and Thomas Luxon, Butler's reading of the gendered discourses, marital privacy, and cognitive separation of Adam and Eve as well as Satan and Sin are used to illustrate the "specifically political complexities of mid-seventeenth-century human intellection" (198). Interestingly, Butler reads *Paradise Lost* aside Martin Lluelyn's 1645 poem *A Satyr Occasioned by The Author's Survey of a Scandalous Pamphlet Intituled The King's Cabinet Opened* and, by doing so, almost seems to be leaving Early Stuart England behind. In the final pages, Butler drifts further into the Restoration by glancing at Milton's *Samson Agonistes*.

In his conclusion, Butler fortunately returns to the 1640s for a more fitting capstone text, *Eikon Basilike*, in order to show the irony of the democratization of intellection in Early Stuart England. Butler points out how the earlier attacks on Charles' royal prerogatives of deliberative privacy and mental impenetrability later served as a tool of royalists in the defense of the monarchy as the Naseby letters were able to set a precedent of authentic access into royal deliberative interiority. In making this return to Charles and the printed incarnation of his mind, Butler reminds us of the quickly shifting landscape of intellection which he has charted throughout his study. On the outset of the Early Stuart Period, the monarchy stood with firm control over thought, yet in the wake of Charles' execution, the public were

impowered to access the mind and interpret the final thoughts of a dead king.

Thomas M. Lennon. *Sacrifice and Self-Interest in Seventeenth-Century France: Quietism, Jansenism, and Cartesianism*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History 304. Leiden: Brill, 2019. xvii + 300 pp. \$139.00. Review by ELISSA CUTTER, GEORGIAN COURT UNIVERSITY.

Thomas Lennon's *Sacrifice and Self-Interest in Seventeenth-Century France* makes a welcome contribution to the growing corpus of English-language scholarship on the religious history and spirituality of seventeenth-century France. His focus is on the debate over the "pure love" of God and its role in the moral theology and spirituality of the period. This topic is framed as a debate between two seventeenth-century movements—both ultimately deemed heretical—Jansenism and Quietism. Lennon, however, approaches this topic from the perspective of philosophy, though he does admit the debate was "philosophically rather inconsequential" (xi). In this, Lennon makes a connection between these two religious movements and a third intellectual movement of seventeenth-century France, Cartesianism. Lennon thus identifies, in the prologue, Cartesians as supplying "the conceptual terms of the debate," namely the idea of the will as expressed in René Descartes's philosophy, while the Jansenists were antagonists and the Quietists protagonists (x). In some ways, this book serves as an apology for Descartes and the misuse of his ideas by others. Importantly, this approach illustrates the way in which the disciplines of philosophy and theology blend together and interact with each other in this period of French intellectual history. In all this, Lennon's goal is to make the history of this debate and its significance more well known among English-language readership, and he succeeds in meeting that goal.

The first chapter examines the foundational idea of pure love, especially by setting the debate in the historical, political, and religious context of seventeenth-century France. As Lennon explains, many at the time in France "were concerned that their love of God be of the right sort, that it not be merely self-serving" (2). Here, he introduces

the “Impossible Supposition,” a test of one’s pure love. This theoretical debate was over whether one could love God so purely that one’s own salvation or damnation would no longer matter. This chapter also traces relevant concepts back to Augustine, whose thought was particularly influential in this period of French history. The second chapter then goes more into the philosophical details raised by the Impossible Supposition, while the third chapter traces the development of this idea in relation to the history of Quietism through major figures and debates in the controversy. An important topic addressed in this chapter is the controversy over the sufficiency of attrition vs. contrition in confessing sins and its connection to the debate over pure love.

Chapter four begins Lennon’s analysis of the philosophical concepts, focusing on freedom, spontaneity, and indifference. He sets up the two opposing philosophical perspectives here: the Molinist-Quietist perspective on one side and the Jansenist perspective on the other, examining the thought of Descartes in relation to both. Chapter five focuses on the Jansenist side, examining Jansenius’s *Augustinus* both in terms of its intellectual history and its positions on grace and free will, as contrasted with the Molinist positions. Chapter six then continues the discussion of the understanding of the will, looking at Descartes’s position. As Lennon notes, this chapter “takes a non-libertarian stance on Descartes” (147), while also aiming to set out the way Descartes is relevant for the debate over Quietism. In chapter seven, Lennon introduces other thinkers into the debate—focusing particularly, but not exclusively, on a lesser-known debate that took place between Nicolas Malebranche and François Lamy. This chapter reintroduces the topic of love, providing an overview of the ways love of self was talked about in the seventeenth century (*amour propre* vs. *amour de soi*) and then using Malebranche and this debate to connect it to his main philosophical focus, namely the will.

Chapter eight turns to the role of Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet. Given the framework that Lennon sets up between Jansenism and Quietism in the controversy over pure love, he identifies Bossuet as a Jansenist—a debated identification for this figure. He introduces this attribution in the prologue, claiming that “if the overall argument of the book is correct, then the principal opponent of Quietism, Bossuet, should be a Jansenist” (xvi, see also 203). So, this chapter, while recognizing

all the problems involved in identifying *anyone* as a Jansenist in this period of French history, looks at the reception of Bossuet's ideas and the way they are presented in scholarship, before turning to Bossuet and his historical context to respond to this query. Lennon looks at Bossuet's writings on the will and in other theological controversies in which Jansenist authors were involved. Lennon's conclusion is that Bossuet shared some views with the Jansenists—especially related to grace and free will—but ultimately submitted himself to all the official declarations of the church on the topic and, in some ways, it's that submission that leads him to be categorized as “Jansenizing” and not fully Jansenist.

Chapter nine, “The Dénouement,” describes the effects of the controversy on the major parties involved. Lennon discusses Descartes, Jansenius (by which he really means Jansenism since Jansenius was long dead by this point), and Fénelon, through which he examines the way the controversy became more clearly Quietist vs. Jansenist. Chapter ten provides a conclusion, summarizing and analyzing the key ideas of pride and pure love, self-interest and selflessness, both in terms of Quietism and their relevance for broader intellectual history. The text is followed by a helpful chronology and two useful appendices: the five condemned Jansenist propositions from *Cum occasione* (1653) and the twenty-three condemned Quietist propositions from *Cum alias* (1699).

Although this book raises a lot of ideas that are worth pondering about the pure love debate in seventeenth-century France, this reader was disappointed by the author's refusal to include in a substantial manner the writings of Jeanne Guyon, who was at the center of the controversy. He describes her writings, like those of Francis de Sales, as “mainly devotional” (xii), and therefore not including sufficient philosophical reflection. He does talk about both of these figures in the third chapter that traces the history of Quietism but does not engage with their ideas in the same depth as some of the other figures in the controversy. As Lennon explains, “[Guyon's] works certainly make for fascinating reading if one has interests rather different from those here” (65). This choice reflects a deeper problem in the history of philosophy and theology of the lack of sufficient attention paid to women's writings because they are not in the same systematic style used by male

authors. The work of John Conley on women as philosophers in this same period of history—and in the Jansenist controversy—shows how women wrote about the same philosophical concepts as men (see Conley, *Adoration and Annihilation: The Convent Philosophy of Port Royal*, Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 2009). In the case of the Quietist controversy, ignoring Guyon's work gives an incomplete picture of the historical debate. Lennon does recognize the artificiality of the distinction between spirituality and theology; for pure love, Lennon asserts that this concept cannot be fully, or only, understood as a spiritual concept, separated from the theological concepts of grace and free will. However, as is often common with the writings of female authors, he places Guyon's writings firmly in the category of spirituality and thus not of interest for theology or philosophy.

Another problematic aspect of this text is a lack of sufficient distinction, in places, about theological issues that have relevance for Lennon's analysis of this debate. Of course, Lennon makes a point early in the text to argue for the philosophical—not just theological—significance of this debate, putting his work in the category of philosophy more than theology. However, at times his analysis of theological ideas makes use of secondary sources that do not fully distinguish between teachings of different denominations of Christianity. Lennon identifies this conflict as an “intramural event among Cartesians” (16), but this debate was an intra-Catholic debate, and one in which the participants would have all been concerned to maintain their Catholicity. That framework needs to be kept in mind in the analysis of seventeenth-century French religious history. This issue is related also to the way Lennon presents his analysis of secondary sources related to the themes of the debate. In another place, Lennon shifts from an analysis of the theological virtue of hope in the debate over the *Augustinus* and Quietism, to an analysis of the way the idea is discussed in an article about pure love, published in 1980, without much distinction between the historical debate and the modern analysis. From a historical perspective, more careful attention to contextualizing the ideas being analyzed would have been helpful.

In spite of these critiques, however, this book is an excellent contribution to the growing corpus of English-language scholarship on religion in seventeenth-century France and would be of interest to specialists in the religious and intellectual history of that period.

Chloé Hogg. *Absolutist Attachments: Emotion, Media, and Absolutism in Seventeenth-Century France*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2019. xii + 276 pp. + 14 illus. \$34.95. Review by IVY DYCKMAN, INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR.

The origin of the term media, as we use it today, probably extends back to the mid-to-late nineteenth century when such modern inventions as the telegraph, telephone, and phonograph incorporated the technology of the time to expand communication with audiences both near and far. As a result, leaders in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries discovered how even more sophisticated advancements in communication would allow them to extend their influence and power over their own peoples and the world at large. Often this was and is done through what we call spin to manipulate points of view and to elicit gut reactions. Although the designation “mass media” did not exist in seventeenth-century France, the Sun King, Louis XIV, did take advantage of early modern communicative modes—i.e., the emerging periodic press—available to him to exert control and connect with his subjects on an emotional level.

In her monograph *Absolutist Attachments*, Chloé Hogg examines how Louis XIV, from beginning to end of his long reign, discovered how the media of the period could be harnessed to ensure total fidelity under his authoritarian hand. Certainly, this media was used as a vehicle for autocratic propaganda. But Louis used the public’s growing interest in his affairs of state, especially wars, to create affective attachments that would touch the heart and thus enchain the people to his absolutism. Art forms, literature, and print media were the primary agents used by the French king to emotionally bind subjects to his will, guaranteeing their uncompromising loyalty. In the five chapters, described below, Hogg traces the evolution of these absolutist attachments, which she aptly used as the title for her book. The historical examples that she selects to illustrate her arguments make for a clearer understanding of the text in general, rendering it more coherent. Her extensive research includes detailed notes as well as premodern and modern sources. The index and a listing of the fourteen illustrations

further assist the reader in negotiating the challenges posed in the work.

Chapters One and Five are the only ones that speak of means other than the written word to engage the public with their monarch in order to construct emotional connections with his absolutism. Hogg introduces her topic with a lengthy discussion of a noteworthy painting executed by the *Premier peintre du Roi*, Charles Le Brun. *Les reines de Perse aux pieds d'Alexandre* (1660–61) emerged at a crucial time in Louis's long reign. Having survived the rebellions of the Fronde, recently married to his royal Spanish cousin María Teresa, and no longer under the influence of the deceased Cardinal Mazarin, the young king undertook to establish his personal rule as an absolute sovereign. Le Brun's painting, a lifelong favorite of Louis, messaged to his subjects the sort of ruler he proposed to be. He is portrayed as Alexander the Great, a "loving king" (22) whose identity was mistaken by royal captives who were consequently pardoned for their embarrassing error. Engravings were widely disseminated so that everyone would know that their young ruler would indeed be loving and merciful. Louis had managed to spin his image, forging his heart and feelings with those of his subjects. Reaching them on an emotional level would solidify their connection and allegiance. This was Louis's initial use of media for propaganda, which proved successful.

Much of Louis XIV's reign was dedicated to going to war with France's European neighbors in order to establish his regime's dominance on the continent. This opened up opportunities for the king as well as literati, journalists, and personal correspondents to express themselves objectively and subjectively about the aggressions. Louis had the advantage of his position to exert influence over and affectively manipulate his subjects. Still, those with pen in hand managed to open dialogue between the sovereign and his subjects. Chapters Two, Three, and Four discuss the power of the written word and its role in portraying, lauding, and criticizing the conflicts. In her treatment of the inception of the Dutch War in 1672, Hogg describes how the crossing of the Rhine became "the first media war of the French monarchy" (18). The king's spin doctors reported it as a triumph while personal accounts by other people conveyed conflicting views. She dedicates an entire chapter to Jean Donneau de Visé, pioneering journalist and founder of the French periodical *Mercure galant*. He

reported the news of Louis's wars to a receptive public. However, he made the horror palatable by interspersing it with items that would entertain his readers: art, literature, society. Apart from royal proclamations and the Te Deum ceremony, the king could thus more effectively bond with his subjects through the innovation of early modern news media. Finally, Hogg describes literary reactions to the sieges of Namur in 1692 and again in 1695. The first was a victory celebrated in the *Mercure galant* and in a poorly received ode by Boileau, which became fodder for parody when the English king, William of Orange, recaptured the fortress three years later. Boileau's bad poem and the ensuing mockery reflected a reversal in the affective bonds between monarch and subject.

In Chapter Five, as in Chapter One, Hogg deviates, for the most part, from print media to demonstrate how the Sun King rehabilitated his image to maintain absolutist rule. After the Namur 1695 debacle, restoration of the affective union between monarch and people was effected by means of the wounded body. Disabled heroic warriors, such as those ghoulishly pictured in Perrault's *Les hommes illustres*, were repurposed to serve society and their sovereign in other productive ways. Scientific and technological contributions, for example, represented a continuation of warfare, this time away from the physical battlefield into that of the intellectual sphere. Louis, creator of the Invalides and agent for the physical and societal rehabilitation of his realm's invalids, recreated himself as well, this time as the "surgeon king" (19). He succeeded in restoring the health of the injured body politic by once again establishing absolutist attachments with his subjects.

NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 68, Nos. 3 & 4. Jointly with SCN. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies. Edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

◆ *Introduction à la méthode de Leon Battista Alberti. L'art de colorer dans le De pictura.* By Isabelle Bouvrande. Le savoir de Mantice. Paris: Honoré Champion, 2019. 330 pp. €52.15. One of the most famous texts in the rich oeuvre of the humanist Leon Battista Alberti (1404–1472) is his treatise on painting (*De pictura*). Alberti wrote the treatise in three books in Florence in the 1430s. An innovative systematization of the art of painting steeped in classical learning, *De pictura* gave a theoretical dimension to the artistic praxis. The text circulated in two versions, one in Latin, the other in *volgare*, both of which flowed from Alberti's pen. The Latin version is not only extant in more manuscripts, but was also printed first, with its *editio princeps* being in Basel in 1540. In the last two decades, a rising interest in the primary text manifested itself in a wave of new editions and translations into German (2000, 2nd ed. 2011), French (2004), and English (2011).¹

1 *Leon Battista Alberti: Das Standbild. Die Malkunst. Grundlagen der Malerei*, ed. Oskar Bätschmann and Christoph Schäublin (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000); *Leon Battista Alberti: La Peinture*, ed. Thomas Golsenne and Bertrand Prévost (Paris: Seuil, 2004); and *Leon Battista Alberti: On Painting. A New Translation and Critical Edition*, ed. Rocco Sinisgalli (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

The interest of art historians in Alberti's theory of painting has often focused on central perspective. The new book of the French art historian Isabelle Bouvrande takes another path. It casts light on an understudied aspect of *De pictura*: the art of coloring (*ratio colorandi*). Complementing central perspective in creating the illusion of three-dimensionality in the two-dimensional art of painting, *ratio colorandi* refers to the method of shading colors in order to suggest a relief (10). Bouvrande sets out to provide the first systematic and exhaustive book-length study of the art of coloring in *De pictura* (7 and 10).

The study takes an analytical approach, isolating a number of terms and notions that inform the art of coloring. The basis of this analysis is the Latin text of *De pictura*, since according to the author, it has a greater lexical richness than the *volgare* version (8 and 12). With its deep engagement with the text and terminology of Alberti's treatise, Bouvrande's study is located at the cross-section of art history and Latin philology. This review approaches the book from a philologist's perspective, highlighting its potential for the field of Neo-Latin studies.

After a short introduction (9–15), the main body of the study is divided into three parts. The first provides a panorama of the sources and fields of knowledge that inform Alberti's presentation of the art of coloring (19–47). It touches upon the collection and systematization of knowledge (Quintilian), natural philosophy (Aristotle), optics (Ptolemy), the history of painting (Pliny) and its praxis (Cennino Cennini, *Il libro dell'arte*), the art of memory (rhetorical handbooks), and myth (Ovid). The second part is at the heart of the work (51–252). In the form of an alphabetical lexicon, twenty-nine terms and notions connected to the art of coloring, from "altérateur" to "voile intersecteur," are isolated from the text and described individually. The third part brings together these terms and notions in order to extrapolate the *modus operandi* of coloring from Alberti's *De pictura* (255–75). At the end of the book, there is an excursus on Giotto, the only modern painter named in the Latin treatise (279–287), as well as three appendices on the Aristotelian concepts of place and the transparent and on the art of memory (291–312).

Due to the analytic approach and the lexicon layout, the understanding of Alberti's presentation of the art of coloring assembles itself like a jigsaw puzzle in the course of reading, until the pieces are finally put together in the third part. The alphabetical order of the second part in particular makes this assemblage a non-linear detective work. The non-linear layout means that readers should have a solid prior knowledge of Alberti's original text or read it in parallel to have a good overview of the course of argument in *De pictura* and the passages central to the art of coloring. In the second book of his treatise, Alberti divides painting into three parts (II 30–50): *circumscriptio* (II 31–34), *compositio* (II 35–45), and *receptio luminum* (II 46–49). The third part is the central passage on coloring in *De pictura* and is quoted most often in Bouvrande's book. The titular *ratio colorandi* appears in II 47, where Alberti states that if the painter correctly outlines the surfaces and determines the areas of light, the process of coloring will be simple (*facilis tum quidem erit colorandi ratio*).² Using *ratio colorandi* as a technical term, Bouvrande interprets it as permeating all three parts of painting and highlights thematic connections to other passages in the treatise.

While the lemmata of the alphabetical lexicon are in French, quotes from the Latin text of *De pictura* are found on almost every page. The Latin passages are always followed by a French translation (the 2004 translation mentioned above) and often juxtaposed with the corresponding parts from Alberti's *volgare* treatise. The quality of the Latin quotes is generally decent, if not free from typos (e.g., 38: *ferocuem* instead of *ferocem*, 158: *excitate* instead of *excitante*, 255: *edsiscant* instead of *ediscant*). A few minor slips in Latin grammar occur as well: e.g., while *concinntitas* and *compositio* are referred to in the nominative, *conlibratio* is referred to in the ablative (211–13: *conlibratione*) and the infinitive forms of *uti* (215: *utere*) and *diluere* (262: *diluare*) are wrong. However,

2 Alberti made an earlier reference to coloring in II 32, using a similar expression: if a surface changes gradually from a dark tone to a bright color, a line should be drawn in the middle of the two areas in order to remove doubts about how to color the whole area (*quo omnis colorandi spatii ratio minus dubia sit*).

these are quibbles that do not affect the understanding of the text. Where the argument steers into philological waters, the results are not always convincing: e.g., when Alberti writes *pinguiore idcirco, ut aiunt, Minerva scribendo utemur* (I 1), he does not allude to Horace's *Ars poetica* 385 (29–30), but imitates Cicero's *Laelius* 19 (*agamus igitur pingui, ut aiunt, Minerva*).³ Alberti's construction of a painter Daemon (II 37 and 41) from a passage in Pliny's *Natural History* (*pinxit demon Atheniensium*, 35.69) seems to be the result of a plausible mistake rather than an active reinterpretation (37–38), if one considers the rate of scribal errors and the fluid orthography in manuscript culture, as well as the fact that transliterations of the Greek δῆμος occur only very rarely in ancient Latin literature (*TLL* s. v. *demos*).

But none of these points of criticism should distract from the merit of Bouvrande's study in tackling a type of literature that requires intimate knowledge of both the subject and the literary language in which the subject is expressed. Based on a close reading of *De pictura*, Bouvrande's study of the terms and notions of the art of coloring bridges the fields of philology and art history. In the field of Neo-Latin studies, it could stimulate further research into the creation and development of a terminology of painting, both in Alberti and beyond. (Irina Tautschnig, University of Innsbruck)

◆ *Miscellanies*. By Angelo Poliziano. Edited and Translated by Andrew R. Dyck and Alan Cottrell. 2 vols. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 89–90. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990. xx-viii + 639, 418 pp. \$29.95 per volume. Angelo Poliziano (1454–1494) was one of the cultural icons of his day, a man who was exceptionally talented as a scholar, teacher, and poet while also becoming one of the first men in western Europe in centuries whose knowledge of ancient Greek approached that of the people who spoke it in classical times. He had his limitations, to be sure: his philological acumen

3 As indicated by the addition *ut aiunt* both in Cicero and Alberti, *pingui Minerva* was proverbial. The proverb has an entry in Erasmus's *Adagia* (1.1.37).

was extraordinary, but he lived before the development of systematic codicology, lacked a community of similarly skilled scholars, did not always have the historical knowledge necessary to identify the shortcomings in some of his sources, and sometimes got carried away in polemic, especially against Domizio Calderini, his principal *bête noire*. Yet he must be given his due. His access to earlier manuscripts gave him an almost unparalleled knowledge of the ancient world, he devised a way of grouping and analyzing manuscripts that was quite advanced for his day, and his Greek was good enough for him to be able to fill in *lacunae* or emend corruptions in the Greek passages that were embedded within Latin manuscripts.

All of these skills were put to good use in his *Miscellanies*. The humanists of preceding generations followed in the footsteps of their medieval predecessors, writing commentaries that went through a classical text line by line and explained everything that a reader might need to know. This approach, however, did not suit Poliziano's temperament. Two of his contemporaries, Domizio Calderini and Filippo Beroaldo, developed a genre, the *miscellanea*, that was based on the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius, in which they isolated particular problems to analyze and solve. This was a more suitable vehicle for Poliziano's talents, and he adopted it eagerly, selecting the most intractable problems and solving them to show off his philological skills, or offering up obscure but fascinating tidbits from his wide-ranging knowledge of classical texts to others who had neither his access to manuscripts nor his prodigious memory.

The *Miscellanies* exists in two parts, each intended to have a hundred chapters; the first set was published in 1489 and the second, which was left unfinished at Poliziano's death, was first printed in 1972. To prepare this work, Poliziano went to the marginalia in the books he owned, his manuscript papers, and the notes that had been taken by his students, all of which have received intense study in recent years and give us a good idea of how he worked. From them he would extract a problem, often a passage that did not seem to make sense grammatically or metrically or that seemed to contradict what was known about the author or his society. He typically presented the passage along with previous efforts to explain it, then showed why those efforts did not suffice; he would then outline his solution and

how he reached it, generally supported by a good number of parallel passages that support his argument. His best solutions present small changes to a received text that he arrived at either by working back to the earliest recoverable reading or by drawing from his knowledge of the kinds of mistakes that scribes tended to make when they tried to read earlier scripts. He was not always right, but his solutions were generally worth considering and some still stand today.

As is usually the case with volumes in this series, this edition of both centuries of the *Miscellanies* is not a critical one. But the history of the text has been examined carefully and the Latin as presented is reliable, with a list of textual variants for those who want it. A lot of work has gone into the English translation, which is more helpful than usual given the kind of material with which Poliziano is working. There are also enough notes to facilitate a first reading of the text. In short, the work itself is well worth the read, and the editors / translators have done a real service in making it much more accessible than it has been. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Fabularum Ovidii Interpretatio—Auslegung der Metamorphosen Ovids. Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar.* By Georg Sabinus. Edited by Lothar Mundt. Frühe Neuzeit, 226. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter 2019. 422 pp. \$149.99. The *Fabularum Ovidii interpretatio tradita in Academia Regiomontana*, first printed in 1555 (Wittenberg: Georg Rhau Erben), continued to attract attention far beyond the lifetime of its author, Georg Sabinus (1508–1560), a German poet, professor of poetry and rhetoric, and first rector of the University of Königsberg. His famous commentary on Ovid was reprinted many times in Germany, but also in France and Great Britain. Fortunately, in 2019 Lothar Mundt published a very valuable edition of this significant work. The edition includes a German translation and a short but insightful commentary.

In his excellent introduction, Mundt outlines the context, content, and impact of Sabinus's *Interpretatio*. In addition to a convincing argumentation for Sabinus's authorship (the *Interpretatio* was sometimes attributed to Philipp Melanchthon), Mundt carefully sets out Sabinus's intention for his work and underlines its didactic relevance

for students and young readers: With the *Interpretatio*, Sabinus primarily intended to improve young people's rhetorical and stylistic skills in Latin versification. He included the discussion of the allegories (moral, historical, naturalistic, and—though rarely—rhetorical; never spiritual) to make the reading more enjoyable. This way, Sabinus's commentary should also provide an exercise for the study of the Scriptures by young Christians. Sabinus arranges his commentary according to the different narratives of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and he discusses the allegories to varying degrees; in some cases, Sabinus offers several possible interpretations. Occasionally he relates his considerations directly to contemporary events or enriches his explanations with anecdotes. Furthermore Mundt contextualizes the *Interpretatio* as one of the early modern commentaries on Ovid and makes a few concluding remarks about the afterlife of Sabinus's work. Mundt's introduction is concisely written, succinct and without unnecessary digressions, but with all the important information and with a clear focus on the preparation of the reader. Mundt's notes on another short work by Sabinus, *De carminibus ad veterum imitationem artificiose componendis praecepta*, help the reader understand the rhetorical dimension and the approach of Sabinus's interpretation of Ovid.

After the introduction, Mundt presents Sabinus's text along with a translation from Latin into German. The presentation of the text is based on the second printing of 1555; Mundt's emendations are reasonable and convincing. Special terms (particularly proper names) or allusions are explained by Mundt on 378–94 in a commentary that varies in length but always supports the understanding of the text, for readers from other disciplines as well. The history of Sabinus's text, the principles on which it was edited, and the critical apparatus are also given afterwards (359–77). Only references to other authors or works mentioned in the text, as well as indirect or direct quotations, are listed in an apparatus placed directly below the Latin text.

One of Mundt's particular merits is the brilliant translation, which accurately and readably reproduces the Latin original. Given the length of Sabinus's text, it is not surprising that a few small words have been lost in Mundt's translation (e.g., *autem*, 'but', 24/l.197; *olim*, 'once', 104/l.238 and 280/l.10; *sapientiae*, 'of the wisdom', 18/l.119; *coelestis*, 'celestial', 34/l.341; *eo*, 'in this', 280/l.27). In even rarer cases,

tenses have changed (e.g., *considerarunt*, 104/l.238, is translated as a past perfect instead of a simple perfect). The superlative in *maximam quoque calamitatem* ('the biggest', 36/ll.360–361) was only reproduced as a positive. The modern punctuation is concise; there is just one comma in the Latin text (*ut res ostendit, et Aristoteles inquit*; 6/l.62) that unfortunately has been forgotten in the translation and distorts the meaning.

There are only a few passages that I would like to discuss in more detail: concerning the sentence *Poetica nihil aliud est nisi philosophia [...] fabulis concinna* (10/l.3), it should be considered whether it would be more reasonable to translate *concinna* as 'fitting' or 'convenient', rather than 'pleasant' (as Mundt does it in other passages, e.g. twice on 6). Then it would not be translated as "Die Poesie ist nichts anderes als eine durch Versmaße und dichterische Erfindungen gefällig gestaltete Philosophie" ('Poetry is nothing else but a philosophy made pleasant by measures and poetic inventions'), but as 'Poetry is nothing else than a philosophy made convenient to the measures and the poetic invention'. On 15, Mundt does not reproduce the syntactic connection *quòd [...], in hoc* (14/ll.73–74) as 'that ..., therein...', but instead constructs a conditional period. For the reference to be retained, it ought to be written: 'But in the fact, that the poets teach [...], they do not agree with [...]'. On 16, the reference of *Dei* ('gods'; l.102) has to be considered: the Latin *homo singulari consilio et providentia Dei creatus est* (ll.101–102) is translated by Mundt as follows: "weil der Mensch [...] von Gott mit einzigartiger Besonnenheit und Voraussicht geschaffen worden ist" ('because man [...] has been created by God with unique prudence and foresight'). The *Dei*, however, is a genetic attribute of *providentia* and means 'divine foresight', so that the sentence should be corrected to: 'because man [...] has been created by God's unique counsel and foresight'. Mundt came to his translation from the comparison between man and animal, which makes it tempting to assume a unique reason of man. On 21, Mundt translates *rerum humanarum conditio* (20/l.155) as "die Bestimmung der menschlichen Dinge" ('the destiny of human things'). In the context that the world would become worse over time, this hardly corresponds to God's plan of creation. Thus I suggest translating *rerum humanarum conditio* as the 'disposition of human nature'. The *[h]omines graves* (122/l.72),

which Sabinus compares with the *homines leves et garruli* (122/l.74), are perhaps less “Menschen mit gefestigter Persönlichkeit” (‘men with a consolidated personality’), but rather ‘serious men’, for a consolidated personality is not the suitable contrast to ‘careless and talkative men’. Besides, when Sabinus says that animals were revered *divinis honoribus* (122/l.79–80) by the Egyptians, this does not mean that they are ‘divine beings’, but only that they were given ‘divine honors’. The word *usitato* (276/l.126), finally, is not referring to the *locus communis*, but to *interitu* (ibid.), so that one should translate it as ‘of the common downfall of heroes’.

These few remarks on nearly 350 pages of text and translation show impressively how carefully Mundt proceeded in his edition. It is to be hoped that thanks to Mundt’s effort, Georg Sabinus will once again be studied more closely in research on the reception of Ovid, early modern approaches to myths, and the history of education or mentalities. In any case, I can be certain that researchers who are concerned with these topics will greatly appreciate Mundt’s edition. (Dennis Pulina, University of Freiburg)

◆ *Grotius Collection Online: Printed Works*. Prepared under the supervision of Henk Nellen and Jeroen Vervliet. Leiden: Brill, 2018. <https://brill.com/view/db/gro>. \$11,920 (free 30-day institutional trial available). Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) is one of the towering figures of Neo-Latin literature in the Low Countries. He wrote plays and made contributions in theology as well, but Grotius is most remembered today for his work in philosophy, political theory, and law, in particular for the idea that the principles of international law, especially those used to justify war, should rest in natural law. His two most influential books in this area are *Mare liberum* and *De iure belli ac pacis*.

In 1914 a collection of 55 editions of *De iure belli ac pacis* was donated by the Dutch publisher Martinus Nijhoff to the library of the Peace Palace in The Hague. The collection included editions in the original Latin as well as translations into French, English, Dutch, and German, published between 1625 and 1901. In the years since this donation, the librarians have worked to establish as complete a collection as possible, of *De iure belli ac pacis* and of other works by

Grotius, in both printed form and in photocopies. By this point the collection is the largest in the world, containing over 1,200 volumes, including 200 editions of *De iure belli ac pacis* in every language, 100 legal works (including *Mare liberum*), and Grotius's writings in other areas like history, theology, philology, and poetry. The two books that remain fundamental for Grotius studies, *Bibliographie des écrits imprimés de Hugo Grotius* (The Hague, 1950) and *Bibliographie des écrits sur Hugo Grotius, imprimés au XVII siècle* (The Hague, 1961) by Jacob ter Meulen and P.J.J. Diermanse, serve as a frame of reference for the collection, which makes the library and its holdings the 'go to' place for research on Grotius.

The library, whose focus is international law, is responding to COVID-19 disruptions like everyone else, but it was open to researchers at the time this review was written. Given the present uncertainty, however, this is an especially good time to stress the importance of online projects. Much of the most interesting work now being done in Neo-Latin studies relies on access to the early printed editions, but even in normal times, not everyone can free up the time and resources to travel to collections like this. Digitization has transformed the way that research can be done, but it can still be quite a chore to assemble a working digital research library from different sources that allow users to do different things. That problem has been solved here, where we have something that remains a real rarity: a comprehensive collection that has been brought together by informed specialist researchers and offered ready made to serious scholars. It comes at a price, but one that is not unreasonable when the savings in time and travel costs are factored in. One can only hope that as more and more of the world goes on line, we will see more projects like this and that they will get the use that is needed to justify their creation. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Musaeum Celeberrimum* (1678). By Athanasius Kircher. Introduction by Tina Asmussen, Lucas Burkart, and Hole Rößler; index of authors and places with commentary by Frank Böhling. *Vita*. By Athanasius Kircher. Critical edition and introduction by Frank Böhling. Athanasius Kircher Hauptwerke, 11. Hildesheim: Georg

Olms Verlag, 2019. Athanasius Kircher (1602–1680) has long been a controversial figure. He was accused in his day and ours of being a quack and a charlatan, but as Paula Findlen noted in the subtitle to a 2004 collection of essays about him, he was also “The Last Man Who Knew Everything.” Interest in him as a serious figure has grown of late, to the extent that the German publisher Olms has undertaken a 14-volume folio series that contains reprints of his main works, fortified with abundant paratextual material in the best tradition of German scholarship.

The main work in this, the eleventh volume in the series, is Kircher’s *Musaeum Celeberrimum*. Ostensibly it is a sort of catalogue of his collection of statues, pictures, and other objects that was rooted in the ancient world and had become an obligatory stop on the grand tour of Europe with which an educated gentleman of the day completed his education. But it was more than that. Kircher’s mind worked in such a way that it reached out to embrace everything at the same time as it effaced the boundaries that kept things apart. This makes *Musaeum Celeberrimum* a tool to appreciate a collection of objects, but it was also a book that was presented as being valuable in its own right, and the book in turn was a physical manifestation of Kircher’s mind. It was organized into three parts. The first part includes sections as varied as *Larvarum marmorearum, fictiliumque vasorum descriptio* and *De obeliscis Aegyptiorum*; part 2 ranges from *Officina vitriaria* and *De magnete & magneticis machinis & operationibus* to *Apparatus rerum peregrinarum ex omnibus orbis pelagis collectus* and *Hermetica experimenta*; the third part goes from *De musicis instrumentis* and *De mobili perpetuo* to *De oraculo Delphico*. The facsimile of the edition published in 1578 by the Janson-Waesberg publishing house in Amsterdam is clearly reproduced and accompanied by the scholarly apparatus that is needed to appreciate a project like this. Like the *Musaeum Celeberrimum*, the introduction is divided into three parts: “Buchgeschichte” describes the social and cultural context in which the book was produced; “Paratexte” examines the material like the title, motto, and dedication that surrounds the text in the book itself; and “Inhalte” focuses on some of the more distinctive content areas like antiquities and Egyptology. A valuable annotated index of authors and places is added, which results in a presentation in which the

accompanying scholarly analysis in total is longer than the facsimile itself. But the scholarship is meticulous and the result is worth the effort that went into producing it.

The other work presented here is the *Vita* of 1684. Here Kircher presents himself in a way that is different from the biography that had appeared some time earlier. The later biography appeared four years before his death and reveals the reflections of a person who had reached the point where it made sense to put his life into a larger perspective. The theme that guides this work is religious, Kircher's belief that his life had unfolded under the direction of God, which places the *Vita* into the literary tradition of popular piety. The presentation of the material differs from that used in the *Musaeum Celeberrimum*, in that the scholarly introduction (this time much shorter) is followed by a modern text with a critical apparatus and a German translation.

In their own ways, each work in this volume provides real insight into the mind of the seventeenth-century equivalent of "The Most Interesting Man in the World," as they say in the Dos Equis beer commercial. Kircher deserves the renewed interest he is receiving today, and both the scholars who are preparing the volumes in this series and the publisher who has taken it on deserve our thanks. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Non omnis moriar: Die Horaz-Rezeption in der neulateinischen Literatur vom 15. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert / La réception d'Horace dans la littérature néo-latine du XV^e au XVII^e siècle / La ricezione di Orazio nella letteratura in latino dal XV al XVII secolo (Deutschland–France–Italia)*. Edited by Marc Laureys, Nathalie Dauvois, and Donatella Coppini. *Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies*, 35.1–2. 2 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2020. XX + 1450 pp. €296. The essays in this collection began as papers delivered at a joint Italian, German, and French research conference that took place between 2012 and 2014 at the Villa Vigoni on Lake Como, whose goal is to promote dialogue and collaboration between Italy and Germany within the European context. The purpose of this conference was to explore the reception of Horace in the Neo-Latin literature of Italy, Germany, and France. The basic structure of the exploration drew

from Charles Oscar Brink's postulate that Horace's place in modern literature could be divided into three categories: *Horatius criticus*, *Horatius lyricus*, and *Horatius ethicus*. The organizers of the project did not adhere slavishly to this scheme, but it did prove useful in grouping what would otherwise have been left as an undigested, although valuable, mass of material.

After a preface by the three editors and an opening presentation by Walther Ludwig, "Die Liebe zu Horaz: Horaz in der europäischen Kultur der Neuzeit," volume I consists of two main parts. Part 1, *Trasmisione e interpretazione del testo*, contains one paper on the manuscript tradition, Claudia Villa's "La circolazione di Orazio fra Tre e Quattrocento: lettori e collezionisti," and two on the tradition as continued in printed books, Antonio Iurilli's "La fortuna editoriale di Orazio nei secoli XV–XVIII," and Concetta Bianca's "Note su Orazio e l'Umanesimo romano: Francesco Elio Marchese, Antonio Mancinelli, Pomponio Gaurico." The last section, on commentaries, is divided into two subsections. The first, on commentaries to the *opera omnia*, contains Donatella Coppini's "L'Orazio platonico di Cristoforo Landino," Nicolle Lopomo's "Iodoco Badio Ascensio commentatore delle opere oraziane," and Nathalie Dauvois's "Le commentaire de Denis Lambin: le discours et la méthode." The second subsection, on commentaries to the *Ars poetica*, contains five essays: Ilaria Pierini, "Gli umanisti esegeti dell'*Ars poetica* di Orazio: il caso di Aulo Giano Parrasio, commentatore indeciso"; Michel Magnien, "Aristotéliser Horace? La *Paraphrasis in librum Horatii ... de Arte poetica* de Francesco Robortello (1548)"; Monique Bouquet, "Jason Denores—Jacopo Grifoli—Francesco Luigini: *L'Art poétique* d'Horace et la *Poétique* d'Aristote"; Marc Laureys, "Neue und alte Wege der Textexegese in Johannes Sambucus' Kommentar zu Horazens *Ars poetica* (Antwerpen: Plantin, 1564)"; and Michel Magnien, "Domestiquer la Chimère par la méthode? Le commentaire inédit de Nicolas de Nancel sur l'*Art poétique* d'Horace (ca. 1581)."

Part 2 is devoted to Horaz in literaturkritischen Diskursen der Frühen Neuzeit. Section 1, *Von Horaz und seiner Rezeption* ausgehende literaturkritische Diskurse, presents five papers: Virginie Leroux, "Une *quaestio* horatienne: *natura an arte?*"; Émilie Sérís, "La formule horatienne *ut pictura poesis* chez quelques commentateurs et

poéticiens humanistes”; Walther Ludwig, “Der expurgierte Horaz im jesuitischen Schulunterricht”; Anja Stadeler, “Die Verhandlung von Obszönität in Lambins Horazkommentar (1561)”; and Jörg Robert, “*Ars sine arte*—Horaz-Kritik bei Scaliger und Heinsius.” Section 2, Die Wirkung der horazischen Dichtung auf die Poetik und Literaturkritik der Frühen Neuzeit, contains four contributions: Mariangela Regoliosi, “Orazio lirico nelle *Elegantie* di Lorenzo Valla: ovvero il posto della poesia nello statuto della lingua latina”; Ilaria Pierini, “Orazio nel *De poetis latinis* di Pietro Crinito”; Perrine Galand, “L’influence d’*Horatius criticus* sur la première poétique humaniste. Le *De poetica et carminis ratione* de Joachim Vadian, Vienne, 1518”; and Tristan Vigliano, “Présence d’Horace dans l’oeuvre de Vives.”

Volume II is similarly divided into two parts. Part 3, Réécritures d’Horace: Présence de l’*Horatius lyricus* dans la littérature néolatine, begins with section 1, Héritages et vues d’ensemble: Michele Feo, “Il re del canto lirico”; Jean-Louis Charlet, “La réception des mètres lyriques d’Horace dans la poésie néo-latine italienne et française (XIV^e–première moitié XVI^e s.)”; Ilaria Pierini, “Orazio lirico nella poesia medicea del Quattrocento”; Tristan Vigliano, “Denise et Canidie: le loi des trois demis (Ronsard lecteur des *Épodes* d’Horace)”; Nathalie Dauvois, “Lieux lyriques à la Renaissance. Les *Carmina* dans les florilèges, les anthologies et les recueils de lieux communs”; and Marc Laureys, “Bemerkungen zur *parodia Horatiana* im Lichte der neueren Forschung.” Section 2, Études de cas, contains five essays: Blandine Boulanger, “L’*Éthos* horatien de Pietro Crinito: le masque d’un poète dissident sous la république Florentine (1474–1507)”; Suzanne Laburthe, “L’imitation d’Horace chez Macrin”; Virginie Leroux, “Le modèle des *Odes* d’Horace dans les oeuvres poétiques et philologiques de Marc-Antoine Muret”; Jörg Robert, “Nachahmung, Übersetzung, Akkulturation. Horaz-Rezeption(en) in der deutschen Lyrik (1580–1650)”; and Marc Laureys, “Die Horaz-Paraphrasen des Jacobus Wallius.” Part 4, Réécritures d’Horace: Présence de l’*Horatius ethicus* dans la littérature néolatine, is the longest, as one might expect. Section 1, Débats éthiques, offers Mariangela Regoliosi’s “Presenze della poesia oraziana nelle opere di Lorenzo Valla: spunti ideologici ed etici,” Tristan Vigliano’s “*Est modus in rebus*: Horace mesuré—Horace moralisé,” Virginie Leroux’s “Éthique et poétique: interpretations et

influence de l'*Art poétique* d'Horace," Nathalie Dauvois's "*Horatius ethicus* chez les commentateurs français d'après 1560 (de Denis Lambin à Henri Estienne)," and Robert Seidel's "Die Rezeption des *Horatius ethicus* im Medium lateinischer Thesendrucke des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts." Section 2, Réécritures des satires et des épîtres, is the longest in the two volumes: Silvia Fiaschi, "Un modello nascosto: Orazio nelle *Satyrae* di Francesco Filelfo"; Roswitha Simons, "*Horatius ridens* im poetologischen Diskurs neulateinischer Satiriker und Poetiken"; Ilaria Pierini, "Orazio nel *Liber secundus epistolarum ad amicos* di Alessandro Braccesi"; Béatrice Charlet-Mesdjian, "Horace dans le *Sermonum liber* de T.V. Strozzi"; Arnaud Laimé, "Les épîtres horatiennes aux sources du renouveau poétique en France au XVI^e s. Les *Epistolae familiares* de Pierre de Ponte"; Michel Magnien, "L'épître horatienne comme dérivatif et consolation: l'*Epistolarum Liber* du jurist Jean de Boyssoné (ca. 1542–1555—ms. B. M. Toulouse 835, 64r–101r)"; Perrine Garland, "Éthique et militantisme dans les épîtres de Michel de L'Hospital (*Carmina*, 1732): pour une réforme de soi même et du monde"; and Karl Enenkel, "Horaz als Lehrmeister der Ethik: Vaenius' *Emblemata Horatiana*." The collection concludes with an Elenchus Fontium et Commentationum (Fontes, Fontes manu scripti, Fontes typis expressi, and Commentationes), three Indices (Index nominum, Index locorum Horatianorum, and Index codicum manu scriptorum), and a Brevis conspectus bio-bibliographicus.

An enormous amount of work has gone into this collection, over a period of several years, and it has been worth it. It has been over twenty years since the appearance of the *Enciclopedia oraziana*, and it is therefore time to revisit Horace's reception in Neo-Latin literature. Antonio Iurilli offered a key foundation from which this reworking could begin in his *Orazio nella letteratura italiana. Commentatori, traduttori, editori italiani di Quinto Orazio Flacco dal XV al XVIII secolo* (Rome, 2004), and the appearance of his *Quinto Orazio Flacco. Annali delle edizioni a stampa (secoli XV–XVIII)* (Geneva, 2017) while this project was in progress offers the bibliographical guidance that is needed as long as such resources as the Robert Patterson '76 Collection of Editions of Horace at Princeton continue to lack proper modern catalogues. There is more work to be done, to be sure: the circumstances under which this project was undertaken, for example, precluded research

on Horace's reception in England. But that has led to a *felix culpa*, in the sense that this is one of the few such volumes that does not contain a word of English. This may sound ironic coming from an American, but I regret very much the growing ascendancy of English within Neo-Latin studies in the past two generations. This collection was born, nurtured, and printed on the continent, and I am pleased to see it in its proper linguistic garb. This has allowed an important point made by the editors to come through clearly: "La variété des langues d'étude et des méthodes d'approche a permis de la mettre en valeur en créant progressivement une vraie synergie, de l'apport philologique de la méthode italienne à la tendance analytique des Français à l'esprit de synthèse des Allemands. Nous avons beaucoup appris les uns des autres et envisagé de manière complémentaire notre sujet" (XVII). Our subject may be the same, but our approach to it is not, and it is good to see what happens when the various national traditions are set next to one another. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *The Latin of Science*. Edited by Marcelo Epstein and Ruth Spivak. Mundelein, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2019. 395 pp. \$29. This book is a stimulating contribution to the recent swell in anthologies dealing with Latin literature from a timespan wider than the more commonly surveyed classical and medieval periods. Viewed even within this relatively progressive group of publications, the present volume takes an innovative approach. If Minkova's *Florilegium Recentioris Latinitatis*, Riley's *Neo-Latin Reader*, and Korenjak's *Neulatein* have made selections from the blossoming field of Neo-Latin available to interested readers,⁴ Epstein and Spivak's collection is the first—to this reviewer's knowledge—to consider Latinity in its entirety for the selection of texts. Moreover, in focusing on the natural sciences and addressing an audience of language learners outside of the humanities, *The Latin of Science* genuinely earns itself a characterization as

4 M. Minkova *Florilegium Recentioris Latinitatis* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2018); M. Riley, *The Neo-Latin Reader: Selections from Petrarch to Rimbaud* (Sophron Editor, 2016); M. Korenjak, *Neulatein. Eine Textsammlung. Lateinisch/Deutsch* (Ditzingen: Reclam, 2019).

something new and very exciting.

The book has its background in a course run at the University of Calgary. The two-term Latin of Science course introduces students majoring in fields other than Classics to the Latin language and its 2000-year-long tradition of writing on natural philosophy. Accordingly, the present volume presents readers with an overview of Latin grammar (249–325) as well as a translation glossary, alongside twenty-three extracts of scientific writing from twenty-one authors on everything from natural history through engineering, mathematics, astronomy, and optics to economics and chemistry. On the book's companion website (<https://www.bolchazy.com/Latin-of-Science-P3958.aspx>), interested readers can also access electronic facsimiles of the volume's texts, as well as exercises in aspects of Latin grammar and their answers. A companion volume that will offer translations of the Latin passages presented in this book is also planned (cf. xvii).

In their aim to stimulate readers with a wide range of periods and scientific subject matter in their selection of texts, Epstein and Spivak have certainly been successful. William Harvey's vivid explanation of blood circulation in his *Exercitatio anatomica* will be a surefire hit, while the anonymous translation of the reflections of Maimonides (Rabbi Moshe ben Maimon) on the dramatic ups-and-downs in the mental and physical condition of his king, Al-Afdal ibn Salah ad-Din, makes for absorbing reading. The comparison of Adelard of Bath's twelfth-century Latin translation of an Arabic rendering of Euclid's *Elements* with the thirteenth-century version from Campanus of Novara is another noteworthy example of the editors' stimulating selection of texts: The case offers fascinating perspectives on both the role of Latin as a linguistic medium in Europe's history and on the transmission of mathematical thought through the ages. Moreover, in their inclusion of clear geometrical diagrams (e.g. 108, 113) and strong notes on the mathematical issues at play in Euclid's text (109–10, 117), Epstein and Spivak show themselves very capable pilots for non-expert readers through the occasionally choppy waters of mathematical propositions and their early forms of explanation.

The editor's well-written introductions to each author and text are both lively and interesting. They offer valuable perspectives on the place of the various works in the history of science more gener-

ally—this holds especially true for the present journal’s Neo-Latin readership in the introductions to Kepler’s *Epitome astronomiae* (145), for example, Copernicus’s *De revolutionibus* (127–28), and Libavius’s *Alchemia* (33)—but there are also engaging details from the life and times of their authors (cf. Galvani’s attitude towards Napoleonic control in late eighteenth-century Italy (95) or Leibniz’s and Newton’s dispute (119)). Lists of further reading for each chapter, or fuller notes on the figures and ideas dealt with in these introductions, would perhaps have made it easier for interested students to take their curiosity further, should they wish.

The notes on the texts are, on the whole, instructive and are surely successful in making the Latin more accessible, especially to less experienced readers. This reviewer shares the editor’s enthusiasm for one of their preferred explicatory techniques, that of reordering a Latin passage into a form easier to grasp, which is put to good use throughout the volume. Occasional moments of ostensibly terse commentary involving either straightforward English translation or the repeated “subjunctive; why?” (cf., e.g., 93) may be less helpful for the wider readership, but they do not hinder the overall impression of a well-thought-through guide to the text for learners.

That a good share of the space in the notes goes to ironing out variations in orthography, spelling, and basic textual issues points to one of the very few problematic choices in the book, namely that of relying on early modern editions and the occasional manuscript as sources for the texts. Many of the resulting snags are straightforward and should not hold up students for too long (e.g., *quattuor* / *quatuor* (32), *Appollo* / *Apollo* (69), or *ijs* / *iis* / *eis* (185)). And the early modern misprints **Rx* (for *rex*, 79) or **a postesartes* (for Greek ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς, 23) are easily explained away, even if they are perhaps unnecessarily troublesome for beginners. But deeper textual issues resulting from this choice are treated frequently in the notes (cf. *iere* for *ire* or *ierunt*, 18, or *inventor* for *invento*, 240, for example). These moments are anything but helpful for language learners approaching Latin texts for the first time. The game of ‘spotting errors’ can be entertaining for bright students, of course, but ‘gloves-off’ textual criticism is surely a step too far for second-semester students.

While a reasonable case can be made for the value of presenting early modern works in their original form when few, or no editions whatsoever, are available, this is not the case for ancient and medieval works. For these texts the editors' explanation of their decision to use early modern sources "in the same spirit as playing period music on the corresponding period instruments" (xiii) does not hold water: We have no surviving autograph manuscripts of Seneca the Younger's *Quaestiones naturales*, Pliny's *Naturalis historia*, or Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*, for example, and the philological work done since the earliest Renaissance editions of their works has done much to improve the quality of the texts and our understanding of their authors' ideas. A quick comparison of the present volume's passages with the latest modern editions of these three authors reveals a remarkably high number of textual disparities, some of them important (cf., e.g., Isid. *Etym.* IV.4.2). It could be argued that Latin readers early in their experience will neither notice, nor likely care too much about, these philological differences. But when one of the stated aims of the book (and of the course at its origin) is to build "an active awareness of one of the most important components of human culture, namely the vast literary output of scientific works written in Latin over a period of twenty centuries" (113), it seems only fair—to this reader—to offer students only the best available texts from the outset. These are, after all, the very product of our twenty centuries of reading the works.

The volume's three appendices offering introductions to the pronunciation of Latin (I), a functional overview of Latin grammar (II), and notes on the formal 'quirks' of the early modern prints (III) are well presented and carefully thought through for early learners. The Latin-English glossary at the back of the book completes the volume as a stand-alone handbook for its readers. Questions may well be posed over the inclusion of the seventy-six-page grammatical overview, especially in light of the easy accessibility of introductions to Latin grammar in academic bookstores. But it must be said that the book's editors undoubtedly reach their goal of offering the "fundamental tools necessary to analyze and translate a text" (xii) in a self-contained volume. Their willingness to forego some of the minutiae of Latin grammar in favor of direct access to the texts they present is, then, to be applauded.

In sum, Epstein and Spivak's *Latin and Science* is the result of an attractive and ambitious concept to introduce students from outside of the humanities to Latin literature on science from a period of over two thousand years. The editors achieve this in an extraordinarily stimulating self-contained volume that sees students through the basics of Latin grammar and into an exceptionally exciting selection of primary texts. Epstein and Spivak's well-controlled notes and comments, paired with their appealing introductions to the texts, are sure to arouse interest among students and language learners, but also among the broader community of Latin readers who have not read widely on scientific subject matter in the language. If this reviewer has had reason to pause over the decision not to use the latest modern editions in the presentation of the volume's ancient and medieval material, this is only to add a voice to the editors' hope that the present anthology "spurs the publication of other works of this kind" (xiii). Epstein and Spivak's *Latin of Science* remains a pioneering contribution in its approach, subject matter, audience and,—most stimulating for this journal's readership—perspective on the history of Latin literature. (William M. Barton, Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for Neo-Latin Studies, Innsbruck)

◆ *Virtue Politics: Soulcraft and Statecraft in Renaissance Italy*. By James Hankins. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2019. XXVI + 736 pp. \$45. This is a book that has been awaited eagerly for some time now. In part this is because its author, James Hankins, is one of the most important scholars at work today in Renaissance intellectual history, so a new monograph from him demands attention. Hankins is as indefatigable in his travels as he is in his research, and he has been presenting and refining his ideas on this topic in lectures and at conferences for a decade. And a book whose premise is that the political thought of the Renaissance humanists *in toto* has been fundamentally misunderstood is bound to make an impact in a way that a single-author study, as valuable as that might be, cannot.

The book is written with admirable clarity around a deceptively simple thesis, that the principal message of the humanist reformers

was “that cities needed to be governed by well-educated men and women of high character, possessed of practical wisdom, and informed by the study of ancient literature and moral philosophy” (XIII). At first glance this point may not seem controversial; what is new is the assertion that this is the central premise of the political philosophy of the age. The general perception is that humanist political thought has little new or interesting to offer, that study should be focused on what has come to be referred to as ‘civic humanism’ or ‘the republican tradition,’ and that scholarly attention should continue to center on Machiavelli as the best entry point into Renaissance political thought. The importance of humanism is widely acknowledged, but not as a movement whose protestations about morals and character formation are to be taken seriously; the prevailing approach is to view it instead as a linguistic and stylistic phenomenon whose best moments are found in the philological work of figures like Lorenzo Valla and Angelo Poliziano.

It is worth reflecting for a moment on how, if Hankins is right, this scholarly train went so far off the tracks. One of the major issues has to do with which sources have been read and processed. Ever since Hans Baron latched on to a handful of works whose preoccupation with republican ideals resonated with his resistance to twentieth-century authoritarianism, scholars in the Anglophone world at least have emphasized the same theme as Baron did. Yet there are many other orations, letters, and dialogues, even poetry, that discuss political themes like the morality of war, the role of wealth in society, the relationship of laws to character, and the need to balance individual ambition with the broader social good. Many of these works have lain unread because they are still in manuscript, even though in this period manuscript dissemination counted as publication in the same way as being printed, and others remain understudied because they are in a language, Latin, that is controlled with less and less facility by each new generation of scholars. The current understanding of humanism also causes problems. Influential scholars like Anthony Grafton and Lisa Jardine have pointed out, correctly, that records of what actually went on in Renaissance schoolrooms reveal an almost total preoccupation with grammar and the identification of names and places, which has led to the identification of a disjunct, again correct (at least in part),

between humanist educational theory and practice. Hankins's response is that Renaissance humanism was broadly concerned with values, but that the evidence for this concern lies in the unread literature of the period, not in student notebooks.

This is a big book, over seven hundred pages in length, but it is fair to ask someone who wants to reorient a field to marshal sufficient evidence to do so. The first four chapters lay out the basic argument, defining key terms and showing their interconnection. The next nine chapters turn to the most important figures in humanist political thought—Petrarch, Boccaccio, Leonardo Bruni, Biondo Flavio, Cyriac of Ancona, Leon Battista Alberti, George of Trebizond, Francesco Filelfo, and Francesco Patrizi—to show that the central concept of virtue politics was widely accepted among influential thinkers and writers. The final three chapters integrate Machiavelli into the discussion.

As I continue thinking about this, I am finding myself persuaded: the idea that character mattered in some way or other is a commonplace of Renaissance humanism, and there is no reason why that concern should not be as central to political thought as it was to other areas. I suspect that not everyone will agree with everything Hankins says, but I am certain that *Virtue Politics* will reset the discussion of Renaissance political thought for the next generation. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Catalogus Translationum et Commentariorum: Mediaeval and Renaissance Latin Translations and Commentaries*. Volume XIII: *Ancient Greek Sophists, Publius Papinius Statius*. Editor in Chief, Greti Dinkova-Bruun; Associate Editors, Julia Haig Gaisser and James Hankins. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2020. XL + 364 pp. \$95. This is the thirteenth volume of a series that was founded in 1946 by the venerable Paul Oskar Kristeller. Its goal remains the same now as it was then: to offer a comprehensive list of manuscript and printed commentaries on each Greek and Latin author from antiquity, along with a detailed essay on that author's *fortuna* and, in the case of Greek authors, a survey of Latin translations as well. Some changes in the series guidelines have recently been made, so that in some cases contributors can go past the original limit of

1600, take account of material written in the vernacular, and include more paratextual information than the earliest volumes did. Readers should also note the existence of an open-access website for the project (<http://catalogustranslationum.org/>), where the first eleven volumes can be consulted in pdf form.

This volume contains two lengthy articles. The first is on the ancient Greek sophists, understood here to include Protagoras, Gorgias, Prodicus, Thrasymachus, Hippias, Antiphon, Lycophron, and Xenias, along with *Anonymus Iamblichi* and *Dissoi Logoi*. In the Middle Ages, access to the sophists became scattered and fragmentary, but in the first decade of the fifteenth century, the translations of Guarino Guarini and Leonardo Bruni began to turn things around. Translations into Latin continued for the next twenty-five years, and Marsilio Ficino's edition of the complete works of Plato with commentary in 1484 also focused interest on the sophists by expanding access to Plato's anti-sophist polemics. In the next century the most important year for the *Nachleben* of the sophists was 1570, when Henri Estienne published his edition of Diogenes Laertius with an appendix of fragments of Pythagorean moral philosophy and Hieronymus Wolf produced his edition of Isocrates's letters and orations. Knowledge of the sophists was also disseminated through miscellanies like those of the *Commentarii urbani* (1506) of Raffaele Maffei and the *Lectiones antiquae* (1516) of Ludovicus Caelius Rhodiginus.

The other author treated in volume 13 is Publius Papinius Statius. The reception history of his poems is complicated and different in each case. The *Thebaid* was his most popular work, surviving in 254 manuscripts. There are multiple medieval commentaries, but the tradition is dominated by two, one that is attributed to Lactantius Placidus (probably fifth century) and the other the twelfth-century 'ip' commentary that seems to have been drawn from multiple sources. Primarily on the basis of this poem, Statius was ranked only slightly behind Virgil as a poet and influenced writers ranging from Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and Chaucer to Tasso, Spenser, and Milton. The *Achilleid* circulated in 219 manuscripts, with the twelfth-century 'Kobenhaven–Pommersfelden' ('KP') commentary and the so-called 'Tradition A' being the major commentaries. The *Achilleid* was seen primarily as an educational aid in the Middle Ages and its popular-

ity declined in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, with interest being largely confined to philological circles. The reception of the *Silvae* went in a different direction: it survives in only thirty-seven manuscripts, and all of the commentaries date to 1470 or later. Once the poems reentered wider circulation, however, they became very popular, with ten collections of *silvae* being published before 1501 and imitations coming from Lorenzo de' Medici, Poliziano, Spenser, and Ben Jonson, among others.

Since 1960, articles on almost a hundred classical authors have appeared, but most of them have been on writers whose works did not circulate widely or attract a large number of commentators. This makes sense: it takes less time and work to cover Juvenal than it does to treat Homer, and since articles are published in the order in which they are completed, it is no surprise to find ourselves where we are now. It is worth noting, however, that the tide is turning: the article on Statius that is published here comes to almost three hundred pages, and the ones on Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and the Renaissance commentaries to Virgil are nearing completion. There is much work still to be done, but the movement into the top tier of the most influential classical authors is a welcome sign of things to come in a project whose results provide the foundation on which any responsible reception study must rest. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Una lingua morta per letterature vive: il dibattito sul latino come lingua letteraria in età moderna e contemporanea*. Atti del convegno internazionale, Roma, 10–12 dicembre 2015. Edited by Valerio Santozza. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 45. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2020. VIII + 451 pp. €79.50. The theme of this volume of conference proceedings is expressed well in its title: how did Latin, a living language that was spoken at the beginning of the early modern period, take on new life as a literary language that continues in use today? After a brief preface that explains the theme and gives a little information about the conference at which it was initially explored, the volume offers the following essays: Andrea Comboni, “Note sulla fortuna dell’*Osci et Volsci dialogus* di Mariangelo Accursio”; Marco Leone, “Latino *vs.* volgare: *scriptores Latini e scriptores vernaculi*

nel Rinascimento”; Martin McLaughlin, “*Il Cortegiano* in Inghilterra: la traduzione latina di Bartholomew Clerke (1571)”; Clementina Marsico, “A ciascuno il suo: discussioni e rivaltà nelle grammatiche latine dell’inglese”; Marc Laureys, “Friedrich Taubmann’s Views on Latin Style and Poetic Composition”; Jürgen Leonhardt, “Lateinische Dichtung zwischen Kommunikation und nicht-Kommunikation: Überlegungen zur Rolle des Gelenkenheitsgedichts im 18. Jahrhundert”; Francesco Saverio Minervini, “Italiano e latino nel Settecento: tra primato della lingua e sovranità politica”; Maurizio Campanelli, “Il latino allo specchio: cultura e scuola in alcune satire italiane del Settecento”; Dirk Sacré, “Girolamo Ferri et ses *Pro linguae Latinae usu epistolae adversus Alambertium* (1771)”; Florian Schaffenrath, “Wie John Milton zum lateinischen Epiker wurde: Zu lateinischen Übersetzungen von *Paradise Lost* und den *Parnassidos libri IV* (1773) von José Pueyo y Pueyo”; Isabella Walser, “Jacob Grimm als Cicero wider Willen? Die Propagierung der Deutschen Kulturnation in Grimms Antrittsrede *De desiderio patriae* (1830)”; Xavier Van Binnebeke and Paola de Capua, “Letteratura e antifilologia nello *Xiphias* di Diego Vitrioli”; Leopoldo Gamberale, “Tradurre i propri versi nella propria lingua: storie di poeti”; Sebastiano Valerio, “Andare in cerca del nuovo tenendo l’occhio all’antico: Pascoli, la scuola e il latino”; and Yorik Gomez Gane, “@Pontifex: la Santa Sede tra latino, italiano e le altre lingue.” The volume concludes with two indices, one of manuscripts, printed editions, and archival sources and the other of names.

As the editors explain in the preface, the conference originally had two parts, one devoted to the Italian Cinquecento and to the way in which the Settecento opened up to a European-wide horizon, and the second that ran from the Otto-Novecento to the modern era. Taken together, this allows an exploration of the full run of Neo-Latin literature, which is beneficial given that, while it is generally recognized in theory that Neo-Latin runs from Petrarch until today, in practice the emphasis often falls on the Renaissance and Baroque. This is also a good place to note that the conference and the publication of its proceedings unite the two most prominent institutional supporters of Neo-Latin today, the Ludwig Boltzmann Institut für Neulateinische Studien in Innsbruck, which sponsored the conference, and the Seminarium Philologiae Humanisticae, which accepted the volume into its monograph series. May this spirit of cooperation long continue! (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)