Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
University of Toronto

http://www.archive.org/details/renaissancerefor101vict

Renaissance and Reformation is published twice a year (Winter and Summer)
© the Toronto Renaissance and Reformation Colloquium
the Victoria University Centre for Renaissance and Reformation Studies (CRRS), 1974

Editor
Julius A. Molinaro

Associate and Book Review Editor
R. W. Van Fossen

TORONTO RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION COLLOQUIUM
Executive Committee 1973-74
Chairman: James McConica
Vice-Chairman: Annabel Patterson (York University)
Treasurer: Leslie T. McCormick

Ex-officio members

Editor of *Renaissance and Reformation*	J. A. Molinaro
Additional Representative of *Renaissance and Reformation*	R. W. Van Fossen
For the CRRS	H. R. Secor
For the University of Toronto Centre for Renaissance Studies	Stillman Drake
Past Chairman	C. E. Rathé (York University)

Subscription price is $3.00 per year. Back volumes are $3.75 ($1.25 per no.). Manuscripts should be accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope and follow the revised edition of the MLA Style Sheet.

Manuscripts should be addressed to:

The Editor
Renaissance and Reformation
Department of Italian Studies
University of Toronto
Toronto, Canada M5S 1A1

All communications, including notices of changes of address, enquiries and subscriptions should be sent to:

Leslie T. McCormick
Business Manager
Renaissance and Reformation
Erindale College
3359 Mississauga Road
Clarkson, Ontario, Canada

All communications concerning books should be sent to the Book Review Editor at the same address.

EDITORIAL NOTE

Renaissance and Reformation will be reduced to two numbers until further notice in order to cut production costs but will, in the process, increase the total number of pages per volume. The cost of the journal will remain the same at $3.00 per volume. A Canada Council grant assisted in the publication of this number.

As a Canadian journal, *Renaissance and Reformation* seeks to strengthen its relations with the Francophone community in Canada and invites their active collaboration. Announcements in this connection will be made in due course.

J.A.M.

Contents

1
Translation Theory in Renaissance France: Etienne Dolet and the Rhetorical Tradition
GLYN P. NORTON

14
John Knox and His Interpreters
W. STANFORD REID

25
'The Revenger's Tragedy.' A Play on the Revenge Play
LESLIE SANDERS

37
'Historia Vom Rasenden Roland' – The First German Ariosto Translation
GERHARD DUNNHAUPT

43
Jonson's Tortoise and Avian
P.B.R. DOOB and G.B. SHAND

45
BOOK REVIEWS

GUY FITCH LYTLE
J. M. Bujanda, ed. *Érasme de Rotterdam, Liberté et Unité dans l'Église*

DOUGLAS H. PARKER
Dickie A. Spurgeon, ed. *Tudor Translations of the Colloquies of Erasmus (1536-1584)*

ROBERTA FRANK
Lynn White, Jr., ed. *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies,* Volume 2

J. W. DALY
G. R. Elton. *Policy and Police:*
The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell

JAMES K. McCONICA
Derek Wilson. *A Tudor Tapestry: Men, Women and Society in Reformation England*

HARRY McSORLEY
Gordon Rupp. *Patterns of Reformation*

ANTONIO SANTOSUOSSO
M. L. Bush, *Renaissance, Reformation and the Outer World, 1450-1660*

CHAUNCEY WOOD

Wayne Shumaker. *The Occult Sciences in the Renaissance: A Study in Intellectual Patterns*

STILLMAN DRAKE

W.P.D. Wightman. *Science in a Renaissance Society*

A.G.R. Smith. *Science and Society in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*

JUAN BAUTISTA AVALLE-ARCE

Arthur Efron. *Don Quixote and the Dulcineated World*

RICHARD L. PREDMORE

Margaret Church. *Don Quixote: The Knight of La Mancha*

EDWIN J. WEBBER

Ruth Pike. *Aristocrats and Traders. Sevillian Society in the Sixteenth Century*

J. H. PARKER

Thomas E. Case, ed. *A Critical and Annotated Edition of Lope de Vega's "Las almenas de Toro"*

Fred M. Clark. *Objective Methods for Testing Authenticity and the Study of Ten Doubtful "Comedias" Attributed to Lope de Vega*

OTMAR HEGYI

Augusta Espantosa Foley. *Occult Arts and Doctrine in the Theatre of Juan Ruiz de Alarcón*

RAYMOND R. MacCURDY

Jack H. Parker and Arthur M. Fox, general editors. *Calderón de la Barca Studies, 1951-69. A Critical Survey and Annotated Bibliography*

ROBERT TAYLOR

Albert Douglas Menut, ed. *Maistre Nicole Oresme: Le Livre de Politiques d'Aristotle*

ANNABEL PATTERSON

Forrest G. Robinson. *The Shape of Things Known: Sidney's Apology in its Philosophical Tradition*

STEPHEN LACEY

Gerald Eades Bentley. *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642*

ELIO GIANTURCO

Frederick Hartt. *History of Italian Renaissance Art*

RUSSELL M. BROWN

Aldo Scaglione. *The Classical Theory of Composition: From Its Origins to the Present*

WALTER H. KEMP

Jerome Roche. *Palestrina*

HANNAH FOURNIER

Joseph L. Allaire, ed. Marguerite d'Angouleme Reine de Navarre. *Le Miroir de l'Ame Pecheresse*

DAVID BRETT-EVANS

Frank L. Borchardt. *German Antiquity in Renaissance Myth*

76

NEWS

Translation Theory in Renaissance France: Etienne Dolet and the Rhetorical Tradition

Glyn P. Norton

The diffusion of vernacularism through translation in late fifteenth and early sixteenth century France is a literary and historical fact well documented in the prefaces of contemporary works and confirmed by the findings of countless scholars.[1] Well before such vernacular apologists as Geoffroy Tory and Joachim Du Bellay, Claude de Seyssel, in a Prologue addressed to Louis XII (1509), calls for the founding of a national literature through the medium of translation.[2] By royal decree, Valois monarchs from Francis I to Henry III make glorification of the vernacular a matter of public policy. Translators, as well as grammarians and poets, are enlisted in a self-conscious national cause, under the "enlightened guidance" of their royal patrons.[3] As theoreticians and apologists begin to seek analogical links between the vernacular idiom and classical languages, translation is seen less and less as a craft of betrayal (conveyed in the Italian proverb "traduttore traditore"). If, indeed, French is capable of the same expressive functions as its classical predecessors, why, people begin to ask, cannot the style and thought of Greece and Rome also be transmitted accurately into the vulgar tongue? Not only is translation, then, a means of literary dissemination to the masses, but more vitally, an agent of linguistic illustration. For this reason, translation theory is often inseparably bound to the greater question of how to imitate classical authors in the vernacular idiom.

While occasionally taking into account this broader function of translation, scholarly approaches to translation theory in Renaissance France have generally failed to examine these theoretical questions within the framework of cultural change. Prologues and prefatory epistles are frequently resurrected by scholars to support differing viewpoints, but without any corresponding effort to see these writings as extensions of Humanist currents. The one speculative treatise on the art of translation, Etienne Dolet's *La Maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre* (1540), is studied as a literary weathervane by which to judge all subsequent theory and its application in specific works. Remarks on translation by the poetic theorists are compared, in turn, to other remarks made either by Dolet or individual translators. In short, certain fundamental questions have been overlooked in the desire to explain these three textual sources – preface, treatise, and poetic arts – as part of a single continuum of theoretical writing abstracted from the context of the new learning and from classical traditions.

Almost without exception, scholars have underscored the special role of Dolet's treatise as a pivotal document of both historical and literary significance, but whose influence is by no means certain.[4] Indeed, Du Bellay is one of the few contemporary writers to even make reference to the work.[5] Its function as a practical guide for the good translator is, at best, difficult to assess. Beyond its skeletal, five-part draft of broad principles, it proposes no set of criteria for the faithful rendering of classical Diction. Even as a theoretical tract it is sketchy and tentative, admitting scarcely any elaboration on its general proposals. It is not, in fact, a work to which the professional translator could turn for specific advice on technical matters. While it does delineate certain basic ideals, its importance would appear then to lie elsewhere.

In his preface to the French people, Dolet tells us that the *Maniere de bien traduire* is one of three tracts prepared as part of an unfinished work entitled *L'Orateur Françoys.* As an attempted "illustration" of the French language, this projected work is to include nine tracts, the last three being the treatise on translation, an "Art Oratoire" and an "Art Poétique."[6] From his opening remarks it is clear that the work represents not so much a short-term concentration of creative effort but the longer, sporadic attention of a classical scholar occasionally distracted by vernacular concerns: "Depuis six ans (ô peuple Françoys) desrobbant quelques heures de mon estude principalle (qui est en la lecture de la langue Latine et Grecque), te voulant aussy illustrer par tous moyens ..." (9).

Whatever the preparations, either written or conceived by Dolet in 1534, six years before the publication of his tract, it is highly improbable that this great Latinist not be in touch with the intellectual revival going on around him. It is generally agreed that the third decade of the sixteenth century is marked by the coming of age of French Humanism, and with this maturity, by the conversion of classical ideals into vernacular functions.[7] An otherwise fervent Latinist such as Guillaume Budé, in *De l'institution du Prince* (1529), describes the transposition of the "perfect orator" into the person of the monarch. Those elements of a pedagogical program already formulated by Cicero and Quintilian, and appropriated by fifteenth-century Italian theorists (Guarino, Vittorino da Feltre, Bruni, and Piccolomini), are thus seen in a new light. While still never more than an abstraction, the orator is cast in a contemporary mold, speaking and writing a vernacular eloquence. The subject of classical Latin imitation, arising in the context of Greek rhetorical models, is transcribed to a modern setting.[8] John Palsgrave (1530), Jacques Dubois (1531), and Charles de Bovelles (1533) each attempt to treat the question of vernacular imitation, especially as it relates to the problem of reducing the French language to an ordered system.[9] In the same year as Budé's treatise, Geoffroy Tory's *Champ Fleury* advocates a goal of linguistic codification in the vernacular while retaining the exemplary status of classical rhetoricians and grammarians: "Pleust a Dieu que quelque Noble cueur semployast a mettre & ordõner par Reigle nostre Lãgage Francois ... iespere q̃ au plaisir de Dieu quelque Noble Prisciã quelque Donat, ou quelque Qintilien Francois naistra de Bref, sil nest desia tout edifie."[10]

This special esteem for the rhetorical ideals of Cicero and Quintilian is, of course, by no means new to France during this period.[11] The ideological fires, however, are well stoked by the appearance in 1528 of Erasmus' *Ciceronianus,* a dialogue deriding the current fad of slavish imitation based exclusively on Ciceronian models. Battle lines are immediately drawn by such pious defenders of classical rhetoric as Scaliger and Dolet, the latter publishing his own anti-Erasmian apology (1535) in behalf of the Ciceronian scholar, Longueil.[12] Royal sanction of the Ciceronians' cause has already been expressed in the appointment (c. 1534) of Barthélemy Latomus as the first Royal Reader in Latin eloquence at the Collège des Lecteurs royaux.[13] Through his course on Cicero, he establishes an important channel for the dissemination of rhetorical doctrine to contemporary scholars.

It is precisely during this period of Ciceronian frenzy and vernacular defensiveness that Renaissance translation theory in France undergoes a subtle change.[14] After 1530, translation is rarely labeled as simply a craft of servile imitation, but is granted more practical and lofty functions. While word-for-word versions and loose paraphrase had traditionally served to teach Latin grammar skills in the Humanist pedagogy, the importance of these exercises for early Renaissance France is confirmed by the publication of numerous bi-

lingual manuals treating the conversion of Latin diction into French.[15] Indeed, the very foundation of Mathurin Cordier's *De Corrupti Sermonis Emendatione Libellus* (1530) lies in the teaching of Latin rudiments through literal and free vernacular equivalents. Occasionally, this pedagogical role is even verbalized in such prefatory remarks as the printer's address to the reader at the head of Dolet's bilingual version of Cicero: "Et ce pour l'utilité tant de ceux qui trauaillent pour apprendre la langue Latine, sachant la Françoyse, que de ceux qu'apprennent la Françoyse par le moyen du langage Latin."[16]

It is thus within the Humanist educational structure that the French Renaissance translator first makes contact with the theoretical principles of his craft. He shares with the Humanist educator the view that classical eloquence can be transmitted from one idiom into another, and that the rendering of style-for-style and thought-for-thought is his higher mission.[17] In his prefaces he refers increasingly to the "sententia"/"verbum" opposition discussed by Cicero and Quintilian and used to defend the transmission of style and thought against the rendering of lexical order. In the preface to his version of a Ciceronian oration (1534), Antoine Macault asserts, in much the same way as Cicero in *De Finibus* (I, ii, 6), that a servile, word-for-word duplication of the original diction must be supplanted by fidelity to the "sententia" and by *approximate* rendering of the original style.[18] Etienne Le Blanc, during the same period, seeks to represent "en la lãgue Francoyse, lart, facunde eloquence, & persuasive maniere de parler de ce grand orateur entre les latins, M. T. Cicero."[19] Echoing similar thoughts in a later version of Cicero (1539), Jean Colin proposes the ideal of translating both style and meaning despite a professed ability to convey only the "sens": "la haulte & difficile matiere qui est icy traictée, n'advient facilemẽt grãd ornement & exorné langaige ioinct qu'il y a plusieurs lieux que l'õ eut peu dire a iuste cause, estre mal tournez, si l'õ eut plus tost voulu s'amuser a la diction, qu'a rendre fidelement le sens."[20] There is little doubt that such translators of classical eloquence regard themselves as collaborators in the Ciceronian revival, but it remains for Etienne Dolet to lend his double voice of Ciceronian scholar and translator to the polemic struggle of vernacularism. His *Orateur Françoys* will be then an implicit vindication of the ideals of Budé and Tory, and of the labors of Macault, Le Blanc, and Colin. Not surprisingly, it will be to the Latin rhetoricians themselves that he will turn for the notion of a higher form of translator-orator who, like Tory's "Qintilien Francois," is a sum total of vernacular and rhetorical expertise. Dolet is therefore using those sources available to him as a student of the oratorical school program laid down by Cicero and Quintilian.

Scholars have been generally slow to acknowledge Dolet's treatise on translation as the natural extension of his Latinist activities and interests. Yet it is inconceivable that in preparing the tract he not be aware of the principal *loci classici* related to translation and its role in the orator's training. In the *Dialogus de Ciceroniana Imitatione,* his defense of Cicero as a translator of verse is a precise recollection of the "sententia" ideal expressed in *De Finibus* and elsewhere.[21] Furthermore, the juxtaposition of his rules for effective translation with their rhetorical antecedents seems to confirm the above judgment.[22]

He knows, for instance, there is no more thoughtful a defense of the literary program than that of Quintilian's Book X (*Institutio Oratoria*) in which translation occupies a major position. In an earlier passage the author had dwelt briefly on the value of reading (especially that of the poets) in the orator's rhetorical formation: "Denique credamus summis oratoribus, qui veterum poemata vel ad fidem causarum vel ad ornamentum elo-

quentiae adsumunt" (I, viii, 10). The stylistic principles forming the greater part of the first nine books are, however, only propaedeutic, theoretical precepts not in themselves sufficient to provide a mastery of oratory ("ita non satis ad vim dicendi valent ..." [X, i, 1]). The gap between theory and practice must be bridged by a kind of *facilitas* based on the Greek concept of ἕξις. In turn, this rhetorical *facilitas* is an acquisition made possible only through the cultivation of Reading, Composition, and Speaking, the inseparable triad which gives flesh and bones to the abstraction of the ideal orator (X, i, 1). It is here that the association between poetry and translation becomes a practical vehicle in the orator's literary program, thereby casting light on the subject of poets and translators to be later developed in the poetic treatises of Renaissance France.

The Homeric ideal, formulated in Quintilian's remarks on Reading, is the poetic-rhetorical substratum for all further literary studies, but Reading alone is no guarantor of the future orator's desired *facilitas.*[23] From the subject of model authors, then, the path to the ideal passes through a transitional discussion of Invention and Imitation (X, ii, 1-28) to the intermediate stage of Composition (X, iii-v). The question of reading and imitation of appropriate models has thereby given rise to the problem of what forms of written exercise the future orator should practice and how best to utilize the initial stage of the literary program. This, briefly, is the context of Quintilian's discussion of translation (X, v, 1-10): not only is it a primary exercise of rhetorical composition, but also the natural extension of literary models and imitative theory.

Well aware of translation's role in the history of classical literature, Quintilian is especially sensitive to its function among the early orators: "Vertere Graeca in Latinum veteres nostri oratores optimum iudicabant" (X, v, 2). He knows, for example, that Cicero's works, specifically *De Oratore* (I, xxxiv, 154-55), contain their own defense of translation as an exercise in composition, as well as important discussions of nuances in translation theory. In these works, Cicero makes certain generic distinctions to be taken up later by Quintilian and transmitted to the Renaissance theoreticians. Crassus, in the *De Oratore,* distinguishes between the school exercise of παράφρασις and the stricter meaning of translation.[24] In the first instance, he chooses a Latin poetic text ("quam maxime gravibus" [I, xxxiv, 154]), transposing its subject matter into his own words, but noting also that he is condemned to repeat the Latin expressions of the original. The Latin-to-Latin paraphrase is therefore later supplanted by a Greek-to-Latin free rendering of certain oratorical works: "Postea mihi placuit, eoque sum usus adolescens, ut summorum oratorum graecas orationes explicarem" (X, xxxiv, 155). Only in this latter exercise does the pupil have greater freedom to formulate his own rhetorical elegance based on familiar idiom as well as neologism (X, xxxiv, 155). After all, he is not trying now to re-create the elegant Latin of a superior model, but rather to render ("reddere") the thoughts of a foreign text into his native tongue. By avoiding the necessity to repeat the usage of the Latin model and by converting Greek to Latin, he is free to create a less slavish equivalent of the original. Crassus appears, then, to be making a significant distinction between slavish paraphrase and free translation, between literalness and looseness in the translator's craft.

It is appropriate that Cicero take up this notion once again in the prefatory remarks to his own translation of Demosthenes and Aeschines: *De Optimo Genere Oratorum.* Although the opposition here, however, is between the translator and orator, there is a similar underlying theme of word-for-word versus philosophical and stylistic equivalent: "nec

converti ut interpres, sed ut orator, sententiia isdem et earum formis tamquam figuris, verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis. In quibus non verbum pro verbo necesse habui reddere, sed genus omne verborum vimque servavi" (IV, 14). As a translator-orator, Cicero is concerned with the rendering of the original "sententia" rather than the strict order of the "verbum," no less a preoccupation of his Renaissance counterpart. The arguments he raises over the "orator" versus the "interpres" seem, then, to relate to a more basic question of *what* to translate: verse or prose? Posed more directly, the question is one of contemporary tastes; translations of verse are more readily accepted than those of eloquence and philosophy: "Quod igitur est eorum in orationibus e Graeco conversis fastidium, nullum cum sit in versibus?" (VI, 18). In *De Finibus*, the argument is essentially unchanged: why do certain critics oppose the translation of serious (that is, philosophical and oratorical) works when they are content to read the more literal, "ad verbum" renderings of Greek plays (I, ii, 4)? Cicero is therefore creating the rationale for a particular kind of translator, as much of an abstraction as his ideal orator. Since textual fidelity is preserved with respect to ideas, and independence with respect to words, the translator is free to concentrate on stylistic elegance in his own idiom, which after all, is one of the ends of this pedagogical system.[25]

In summary, then, Cicero transmits to Quintilian several basic notions on translation theory: the predominance of "sententia" over "verbum" and of looseness over literalness; the exercise, through translation, of stylistic skills in one's own idiom; a defensiveness based on the feeling that translations of poetic texts are more acceptable than those of oratorical and philosophical ones; the crucial distinction, albeit incomplete, between paraphrase from Latin and translation from Greek; and finally, the concept of translation as a rhetorical exercise and of the orator as the potential transmitter of classical knowledge and expression.

Having found in Cicero an apologist for translation, Quintilian is quick to follow the same generic distinctions between translation and paraphrase found in the *De Oratore*, but with differing emphasis. While the possibilities for rhetorical excellence in one's own idiom are maximized by Greek-to-Latin translation (X, v, 3), the use of paraphrase has its own special value superior to Cicero's concept of slavish paraphrase from Latin-to-Latin and more akin to the concept of model translation contained in *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* and *De Finibus*.[26] The most striking aspect of paraphrase, then, for Quintilian, is its literary ascendancy over the mere word-for-word adaptation of an original text: "Neque ego paraphrasim esse interpretationem" (X, v, 5). Paraphrase thereby transcends the copier's craft, vying with the model for artistic excellence and conveying to French Renaissance theoreticians the notion of translation as an independent, generic form of literary activity.

It is here that the contact between translation and the poetic-rhetorical tradition becomes most explicit. Referring to the example of Sulpicius, Quintilian defends the practical value not only of paraphrase based on poetic texts, but of verse-to-prose equivalents of the original (X, v, 4).[27] Thus, the paraphrast must bring to his version the power of oratory and take from his model the "sublimus spiritus" of poetic expression (X, v, 4). By extracting the quintessential "sententia" from the text and freeing himself from the lexical order, he may use his rhetorical faculties to even improve on his model: "Sed et ipsis sententiis adiicere licet oratorium robur et omissa supplere, effusa substringere" (X, v, 4). This textual refinement through paraphrase has a dual aspect. It seeks both to abridge and embellish, transformations prescribed in earlier references to the "brevitas" and "exornatio" of paraphrase (I, ix, 2).

As Cicero has already done in *De Finibus*, Quintilian now raises the question of contemporary tastes. Is not the orator-translator as equipped to apply himself to oratorical texts as to poetic ones? Indeed, common prejudice seems to dictate that paraphrase of the orators, inasmuch as it strives for expressions superior to those of the model, is a futile exercise. Not so, says Quintilian; discovery of new and even superior modes of expression is always possible for the diligent translator-orator: "Nam neque semper est desperandum, aliquid illis, quae dicta sunt, melius posse resperiri ..." (X, v, 5). There is not one, but a multitude of rhetorical paths to formulation of the same "sententia." The translator, in seeking his own path, is therefore free to put to use the "brevitas" and "exornatio," and achieve his own rhetorical creation. The difficulty of the exercise is ultimately the measure of its pedagogical value: "Ipsa denique utilissima est exercitationi difficultas" (X, v, 8). There is, in fact, no better way to penetrate and comprehend the writings of model authors, despite the translator's crucial sense of their inimitability (X, v, 8).

Not inappropriately, given the fact of Etienne Dolet's Ciceronian training and bias, the setting of his treatise on translation reveals a clear justification for the transmission of these oratorical values into the vernacular tongue. Although broken into much broader and traditionally rhetorical categories than the *Deffence et Illustration de la langue françoyse* (1549), Dolet's manifesto was to have been an unquestionable anticipation of Du Bellay's later, more celebrated apology for the French language. By placing himself in the company of such classical giants as Demosthenes, Homer, Cicero, and Virgil, Dolet is formulating a not infrequent stand taken by other vernacular apologists: after the example of our Greek and Latin models, we must not desert our native tongue in order to gain renown in another. On the contrary, we should work to reduce our vernacular to a cohesive system: "... et peu à peu par le moyen et trauail des gens doctes elle [la langue française] pourra estre reduicte en telle parfection que les langues dessusdictes" (6). Despite the work's unfinished state, it is nevertheless clear the creation of linguistic regularity for the French language depends, in Dolet's mind, on the application of classical rhetorical doctrines to vernacular goals. Those same verbal faculties developed by the perfect orator of Cicero and Quintilian are no less those to be acquired by "L'Orateur Françoys." Within this pedagogical scheme, it is thus fitting that a tract on translation theory take its place alongside those treating poetic and oratorical techniques.

In this context, Dolet's *Maniere de bien traduire* is much more than a simple guide for the good translator, abstracted from its rhetorical framework and used to gauge the application of theory to specific contemporary translations. Rather it confirms translation's function as that pedagogical exercise already alluded to in Cicero and Quintilian. Just as the classical rhetorician sees translation as one of a series of acquisitions for the maturing orator, Dolet's remarks are not directed at translation as a self-contained end. Were his only concern that of preparing a translator's manual, crammed with bilingual examples for the rendering of Latin diction, he might well have followed the pattern of earlier treatises by Robert Estienne.[28] His task is that of the generalist, laying out broad, theoretical rules. He seeks not to mold a professional translator, but to guide his French orator to a more intelligent reading and understanding of model authors in much the same way as Cicero and Quintilian had already done. His five rules for effective translation are, then, formulistic precepts aimed at the creation of a total individual, and not at the narrow professionalism of a specialist.

Dolet's rules are an unequivocal extension of that higher form of translation-paraphrase discussed by Cicero and Quintilian. They illustrate, in sum, the very definition of paraphrast (drawn up by Dolet's contemporary, Robert Estienne) as a translator who renders not word-for-word, but sense-for-sense, almost in the manner of speech.[29] It is to the meaning of his model text, then, that the translator must first address himself: "il fault que le traducteur entende parfaictement le sens et matiere de l'autheur qu'il traduict" (13). Like Cicero's perfect orator and Quintilian's translator-paraphrast, Dolet's translator performs this exercise *ut orator* rather than *ut interpres*. Only upon close scrutiny of the model text and the application of his intelligence can he hope to enlighten his reader. Occasionally, he may, as prescribed by Quintilian, improve on his model through textual transformation: "si l'autheur lequel il traduict est aucunement scabreux, il le pourra rendre facile et du tout intelligible" (13). Dolet goes on to cite an example of "exornatio" he himself has used in rendering a difficult passage of Cicero's *Tusculanae Disputationes*.[30] Slavish imitation is thus unthinkable for the translator-orator; he must create his own aesthetic identity within the framework of the model's "sententia."

If the importance of textual understanding seems to belabor the obvious, the second rule is no less self-evident: "c'est que le traducteur ait parfaicte congnoissance de la langue de l'autheur qu'il traduict: et soit pareillement excellent en la langue en laquelle il se mect à traduire" (14-15).[31] This requirement of linguistic proficiency hides, however, its own well-defined rationale. Each language is a single entity, possessing a particular set of properties, figurative expressions, and locutions. In the case of the ignorant translator unschooled in either the model language or his native idiom, he cannot avoid betraying either medium. Dolet appears, in fact, to suggest that this attention to linguistic proficiency should be a major consideration of the translator grappling with the most challenging of texts – the Ciceronian oration: "Cuydes tu que si un homme n'est parfaict en la langue Latine et Françoyse, qu'il puisse bien traduire en Françoys quelque oraison de Ciceron?" (15). By extension, no text makes more stringent demands on the translator, calling on him to be aware of linguistic particularities and the untranslatable nature of certain passages.[32] To what specific end, then, should he direct his energies?

From his preceding remarks, Dolet formulates the third, and perhaps central rule of his treatise: "il ne se fault pas asservir iusques à la que l'on rende mot pour mot. ... Car, s'il a les qualitez dessusdictes ... sans auoir esgard à l'ordre des mots, il s'arrestera aux sentences, et faira en sorte que l'intention de l'autheur sera exprimée, gardant curieusement la proprieté de l'une et l'aultre langue" (15).[33] The rhetorical source of these words is, of course, unmistakable; indeed, the "verbum"/"sententia" opposition of Cicero and Quintilian could hardly be stated more explicitly. As his classical predecessors had done, Dolet sees two classes of translators: the slavish imitators who, in their ignorance and folly, "se submettent à servitude" (16), and the translator-orators whose attention is drawn to transmitting the idea ("sentence") while preserving the integrity and grace of both languages. It follows that if each language is seen as a system of distinct properties, it is quite likely that among certain of these properties there can be no interchangeability and thereby no word-for-word equivalent. Fidelity to the idea over lexical order also presupposes a fidelity to linguistic integrity.

With this in mind, Dolet turns his attention to the special problem of usage: "il te fault garder d'usurper mots trop approchans du Latin, et peu usitez par le passé: mais contente

toy du commun, sans innouer aucunes dictions follement, et par curiosité reprehensible" (16-17). As the fourth rule for effective translation, these remarks, while directed explicitly at vernacular idioms ("langues non reduictes en art" [16]), closely parallel similar concerns of the classical rhetoricians. The ideal of common usage, for instance, is formulated by Cicero in precisely the same passage of *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* treating the "verbum"/ "sententia" opposition.[34] At the extremes of common usage, one finds either Latinisms or neologisms, forms to be used sparingly, but nevertheless not entirely out of bounds for the intelligent translator-orator. Common usage, for Dolet, thus represents the middle ground of the ideal translator, but is not the hard and fast rule proposed by certain scholars.[35] Indeed, Cicero is quick to offer his translator the option of neologism if it is practiced judiciously.[36] The words "trop," "follement," and "par curiosité," used in the above passage, describe then the excesses of the ignorant translator. Functioning much like Cicero's "dummodo essent idonea," they imply a caveat rather than an absolute interdiction. For Dolet, in keeping with his model rhetoricians, knows well that certain words do not submit to translation and that neologisms as well as Latinisms are frequently unavoidable.[37] Contrary to the categorical application of this rule suggested by Lebègue, a careful reading of the text confirms our more relative interpretation: "Pour cela n'entends pas que ie die que le traducteur s'abstienne totallement de mots qui sont hors de l'usaige commun ..." (17). The danger of using the tract as an absolute gauge for contemporary translation practice is apparent: its rhetorical setting, purpose, and inspiration necessarily bind its functions to the greater corpus of Dolet's nine-part thesis. At any rate, the rule is sufficiently important in the author's mind to warrant independent treatment in *L'Orateur Françoys.*[38]

Having been amply treated by Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian,[39] Dolet's fifth rule – on the use of euphony and rhythm – is the most explicitly rhetorical precept of his treatise on translation: "l'obseruation des nombres oratoires: c'est asscauoir une liaison et assemblement des dictions auec telle doulceur, que non seulement l'ame s'en contente, mais aussi les oreilles ... et ne se faschent iamais d'une telle harmonie de langage" (17-18). While its specific role in translation theory is never more than implied by Cicero and Quintilian, its importance cannot be overlooked by the translator-orator intent on matching the style of his model.[40] Dolet is therefore re-stating a rule familiar to every young student of rhetoric and by no means new to translation theory.[41] Its role is further confirmed by several contemporary rhetoricians, although not in the context of translation.[42] There is also little doubt that, like the preceding rule, Dolet intends to treat the subject in depth and separately in his projected work (18). What does seem notable, then, is the author's desire to incorporate in his theory an increasing preoccupation of his fellow translators: the transmission of classical style into vernacular expression.

It is upon this rule that all the others appear to hinge. Without euphony and rhythm the "sentence" is deprived of vital gravity and the diction of propriety and elegance: "et sans yceulx les sentences ne peuuent estra graues et auoir leur poids requis et legitime. Car penses tu que ce soit assés d'auoir la diction propre et elegante sans une bonne copulation des mots?" (18). Of the five precepts for the good translator, only this last applies with equal force to the translator-orator as well as to the general author. Its relevance extends universally as a rhetorical principle for all vernacular writing: "sans grande obseruation des nombres un autheur n'est rien" (19).

In the course of his treatise, Dolet has broadened his concerns, moving from a purely mechanical phase of linguistic proficiency and its role in textual understanding to the greater problem of stylistic elegance in the vernacular. His fifth rule aims not so much at the particular faculties to be exercised by the ordinary translator, but rather at the deeper concerns of how to train the extraordinary translator-orator. The tract's significance strikes ultimately beyond the immediate functionalism of a technical manual. As with the classical rhetoricians, it shares in a broader moral and intellectual scheme – the shaping of the perfect orator. From its classical counterpart Dolet seeks to forge a vernacular ideal. His final words thus bind his tract to a work never to be concluded and a perfection never to be realized: "sans grande obseruation des nombres un autheur n'est rien: et auec yceulx il ne peult faillir à auoir bruict en eloquence, si pareillement il est propre en diction, et graue en sentences: et en arguments subtil. Qui sont les poincts d'un orateur parfaict ..." (19).[43]

Etienne Dolet is by no means the first of his generation to treat translation according to rhetorical theories. We have seen that Antoine Macault, Etienne Le Blanc, and Jean Colin had verbalized in their prefatory writings important aspects of the classical doctrine. As an exercise of composition frequently prescribed by the Renaissance educator, translation is already firmly based in the school programs of France and Italy. The *Maniere de bien traduire* does, however, represent the first attempt by a French theoretician to codify the principles of effective translation. If scholars have generally examined the work apart from its rhetorical framework, such oversights may be attributed solely to one factor: the tendency to look for its causal rather than symptomatic role. It proposes, of course, no stock of radically fresh ideas to inspire a new generation of translators. Neither is it a technical manual replete with specific formulae and examples. Its roots are more conventional, from the standpoint not only of classical theory, but perhaps more fundamentally, of the vulgarization of rhetorical ideals. The Renaissance translator, in his higher rhetorical form, is thereby encouraged to take his place alongside the poets, orators, grammarians, and other participants in the quest for a national literary and linguistic identity. As with Cicero and Quintilian, Dolet's theory of translation is the fractional part of a greater pedagogical scheme – a scheme entirely within the Humanistic currents of new learning.

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park

Notes

1 The following works are among the most significant theoretical treatments of French Renaissance translation: A. de Blignières, *Essai sur Amyot et les traducteurs français au XVIe siècle* (Paris: Durant, 1851); Paul Herbert Larwill, *La Théorie de la traduction au début de la Renaissance*, diss. (Munich: Wolf, 1934); Raymond Lebègue, "Les traductions en France pendant la Renaissance," *Association Guillaume Budé, Actes du Congrès, Congrès de Strasbourg* (1938), (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1939), pp. 362-77; Jean Porcher, "La *Théologie naturelle* et les théories de la traduction au XVIe siècle" in *Oeuvres complètes* of Montaigne, ed. A. Armaingaud, vol. 10 (Paris: Conard, 1935), pp. 447-79; René Sturel, *Jacques Amyot, traducteur des Vies parallèles de Plutarque* (Paris: Champion, 1908).

2 See the "Prologue de messire Claude de Seyssel, evesque de Marseille," in *La trãslation de Justin, abbreviation des Histoires de Trogue Põpee* (Paris, 1509), as well as the important essay of Ferdinand Brunot, "Un projet d'enrichir, magnifier et publier la langue française en 1509," *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, I (1894), 27-37. While there are earlier French apologists for the vernacular, Seyssel is one of the first to

promulgate the founding of a "licterature en françois." Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900*, II, "Le seizième siècle" (Paris: Colin, 1906), p. 29.

3 See especially Brunot, *Histoire*, II, 27-35; and Hubert Gillot, *La Querelle des anciens et des modernes en France* (Paris: Champion, 1914), pp. 3-29.

4 With varying degrees of qualification, the following studies treat the work's importance: Hennebert, *Histoire des traductions*, pp. 37-40; Lebègue, "Les traductions en France," pp. 364-76; Porcher, "La *Théologie naturelle*," pp. 453-56; Peter Rickard, *La Langue française au seizième siècle* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1968), pp. 8-9; Sturel, *Jacques Amyot*, pp. 187-89; Richard C. Christie, *Etienne Dolet: the Martyr of the Renaissance (1508-1546)*, new ed. revised and corrected (London: Macmillan, 1899), pp. 353-64.

5 In the *Deffence et Illustration de la langue françoyse* (I:12), he makes passing reference to *L'Orateur Françoys.* On the other hand, six reprintings of the *Maniere* between 1540 and 1550 attest to its relatively wide circulation.

6 The nine tracts are listed in the following order: "La Grammaire," "L'Ortographe," "Les accentz" (published with the *Maniere*), "La Punctuation" (published with the *Maniere*), "La Pronunciation," "L'Origine d'aucunes Dictions," "La Maniere de bien traduire," "L'Art Oratoire," "L'Art Poetique." *La Maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en autre* (1540; rpt. Paris: Techner, 1830), pp. 9-10; all other references will be to this edition.

7 The founding of the Collège des Lecteurs royaux (c.1530) is generally considered the pivotal event of this period because it establishes the autonomy of the literary program from matters of theological reform: see R. R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries From the Carolingian Age to the End of the Renaissance* (1954; rpt. New York: Harper, 1964), pp. 309-10; and Henry Hornik, "Three Interpretations of the French Renaissance," *Studies in the Renaissance*, VII (1960), p. 61.

8 On this analogical connection, see Jacques Peletier's Preface to his translation of the *Ars Poetica* (Paris, 1545).

9 Cf. John Palsgrave, *L'Eclaircissement de la langue française* (London, 1530); Jacques Dubois, *In Linguam Gallicam Isagoge* (Paris, 1531); and Charles de Bovelles, *De Differentia Vulgarium Linguarum et Gallici Sermonis Varietate* (Paris, 1533).

10 See the Prologue "Aux Lecteurs."

11 Following the recovery of the *De Oratore* and the *Institutio Oratoria* in the early fifteenth century, Padua and Florence quickly became the principle centers of Ciceronianism. The movement, however, was by no means the exclusive domain of Italian Humanists. As a disciple of Petrarch, Jean de Montreuil was also undoubtedly inspired by Ciceronian imitation. His friend, Nicholas de Clémenges, gave up the monastic life in 1425 to teach Ciceronian rhetoric at the Collège de Navarre. Throughout the fifteenth century, in fact, Cicero and Quintilian were well ensconced in the school programs of both France and Italy. In the case of Dolet and his fellow Ciceronians, Longueil and Villeneuve, Padua continued to exert its traditional influence. For a broader view of the problem, see: Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage*, pp. 265-379; Augustin Renaudet, *Préréforme et Humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie (1494-1517)*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Librairie d'Argences, 1953), p. 77 and passim; Christie, *Etienne Dolet*, pp.18-37; 195-228; Izora Scott, *Controversies over the Imitation of Cicero* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1910), no. 35, pp. 3-23.

12 See the *Dialogus de Ciceroniana Imitatione pro C. Longolio* (Lyon, 1535).

13 See Abel Lefranc, *Histoire du Collège de France* (Paris: Hachette, 1893), pp.183-84.

14 Porcher attaches special importance to the role of Latomus in this development. "La *Théologie naturelle*," pp. 450-51.

15 As early as 1528, Robert Estienne published a treatise on the rendering of Latin verbs into French: *La Maniere de tourner en langue françoise les verbes actifz, passifz, gerundifz, supins & participes ...* (Paris. 1528), followed later by: a systematic study of Latin nouns accompanied by their French equivalents (*La Maniere de tourner toutes especes de noms Latins, en nostre langue françoyse* [Paris, 1537]; a manual on the translation of Latin verbs (*Coniugaisons latines et françoyses de verbes Actifz avec Passifz ...* [Paris, 1540]); a bilingual text on the declension of Latin and French verbs (*De Gallica verborum declinatione* [Paris, 1540]). Although these tracts indicate that Latin-to-French translation is considered a means of teaching Latin grammar, this in no way diminishes their availability as technical manuals for the translator. On this important, but little explored problem, see Brunot, *Histoire*, II, 6-14. Humanistic/pedagogical

approaches to translation are to be found in Piccolomini's *De Liberorum Educatione* (1450); Guarino's *De Ordine Docendi et Studendi* (1458); Sadoleto's *De Liberis Recte Instituendi* (1530); Erasmus' *De Ratione Studii* (1511); Elyot's *The Governour* (1531). References to the role of bilingualism in the Humanistic system can be found throughout two basic works of William H. Woodward: *Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance, 1400-1600,* ed. Lawrence Stone (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967); and *Vittorino da Feltre and Other Humanist Educators* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1912).

16 Found in *Les epistres familiaires de M. T. Ciceron* (Paris, 1564), and first published at Paris in 1542. Bilingual translations are not uncommon in Renaissance France and would appear to fulfill those functions described by the Humanist pedagogical theorists. No scholars to my knowledge, however, have examined the role of such versions in light of Humanist theory.

17 On this Humanist ideal, see Battista Guarino's *De Ordine,* cited in Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre,* pp.167-68. In his treatise, Guarino calls many times on the pedagogical authority of Cicero and Quintilian. His remarks on translation are no less directly reminiscent of these two classical rhetoricians. It should also be noted that as early as the 12th century analysis of words ("littera"), superficial meaning ("sensus"), and deeper meaning ("sententia") was part of the textual "expositio" in the school program. G. Paré, A. Brunet, P. Tremblay, *La Renaissance du XIIe siècle, les écoles et l'enseignement* (Paris: Vrin, 1933), pp.116-18; and p.267ff.

18 *L'Oraison que fist Ciceron à Cesar pour le rappel de Marcus Marcellus, senateur romain* (Paris, 1534).

19 *Troys oraisons, traduictes de la langue latine en la françoise* (Paris, c.1534). In his important study, L. Delisle has shown that at least three sets of Le Blanc's Cicero translations were circulating in manuscript form well before their first printing: 1) between 1526 and 1531, the translator was preparing a collection of twelve orations to be presented to Francis I; 2) in 1531, he compiled a manuscript of four orations for Anne de Montmorency, three of which (for Marcellus, Pompey, and Ligarius) were printed in the above-mentioned 1534 edition; 3) between 1529 and 1531, he was also preparing a third set of orations for presentation to the Chancellor Antoine Du Prat. "Traductions d'auteurs grecs et latins offertes à François Ier et à Anne de Montmorency par Estienne Le Blanc et Antoine Macault," *Journal des Savants* (août, 1900), pp.476-92; 520-34. While Delisle fails, as does Lanson, to cite the 1534 edition of the *Troys oraisons,* he does mention that a number of now rare printings of these manuscripts achieved wide circulation. The copy of the *Troys oraisons,* in the possession of Harvard's Houghton Library, would appear to be just such an edition. In the work's prefatory address, Le Blanc, in fact, reminds Francis that prior to this printed edition he had already read for the royal Court a set of twelve orations – a probable reference to the first of the forenamed manuscripts. From these data, one can begin to see, then, further confirmation of the synchronism between two important cultural movements in the 1530s: on the one hand, the Ciceronian revival; on the other, the vulgarization of oratorical texts.

20 See Colin's address "au lecteur" at the head of Cicero's "Le Songe de Scipio," *Les oeuures de M.-T. Cicero, père d'eloquence latine* (Paris, 1539). This work is not to be confused with *Les Oraisons de M. T. Cicero, père d'eloquence latine* (Paris, 1541), a compilation of translations by Le Blanc, Macault, Claude de Cuzzy, and Pierre Saliat.

21 See Scott, *Controversies,* pp.74 and 78, for these specific passages. Dolet also shows familiarity with Quintilian's views on imitation, concepts developed peripherally to the remarks on translation theory in the *Institutio Oratoria.* Scott, p.69.

22 As this study will show, Cicero (*De Oratoria, De Optimo Genere Oratorum,* and *De Finibus*) and Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria*) are the principal sources of the doctrine. Less important references, however, may be found in Horace's *Ars Poetica* (vv.133-34); and Boethius' *In Isagogen Porphyrii Commentorum,* ed. Samuel Brandt (Vindobonae: Tempsky, 1906), p.135. Other than the treatments given by Cicero and Quintilian, the most extensive pre-Renaissance discussion of "verbum"/"sententia" is contained in Saint Jerome's letter to Pammachius, entitled *De Optimo Genere Interpretandi.* The association of the letter's title with Cicero's Preface, *De Optimo Genere Oratorum,* is not fortuitous; the rhetorical context and sources of Jerome's words are quite clear. While the formula is also found scattered among certain French vernacular translations of the late fifteenth century (see

Larwill, *La théorie*, pp.7-34), only later is it taken up in a less conventional way by the Ciceronian apologists in the early sixteenth century. See also St. Augustine's *De doctrina christiana.*

23 Quintilian ascribes to Homer the dual, contingent powers of poetry and oratory ("nec poetica modo sed oratoria virtute eminentissimus" [X, i, 46]), a duality by no means new to Renaissance theoreticians, but already transmitted to the Middle Ages which held that poetry was simply a subdivision of rhetoric. See Ernst Robert Curtius, *Europäische Litteratur und Lateinisches Mittelalter,* 6th ed. (Bern: Francke, 1967), pp.155-62.

24 In the Greek schools of the third and second century, pupils perform two exercises akin to the translation of poetry from one language into another: 1) a literal, word-for-word paraphrase of the poem into everyday language; 2) a free, rhetorical equivalent based on oratorical rather than spoken style. Roman schools later adopt these exercises, employing both Greek and Latin texts, but in order to counter the mounting criticism of paraphrase from Greek, translation theoreticians begin to raise, as does Quintilian (X, v, 5), the notion that the paraphrast is capable of improving on the model text. Cf. H. D. Jocelyn, ed., *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1967), pp.25-28; Giuseppe Giangrande, "On the Origins of the Greek Romances: the Birth of a Literary Form," *Eranos,* LX (1962), 132-59; H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity,* trans. George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), pp.255; 263-64. On the use of paraphrase in Christian poetry, see Curtius, *Europäische Litteratur,* pp.157-58.

25 At the end of *De Optimo Genere Oratorum,* Cicero summarizes concisely this fidelity, stating his intention to translate all the textual virtues of his model authors while utilizing the rhetorical powers of his own idiom: "id est sententiis et earum figuris et rerum ordine, verba persequens eatenus, ut ea non abhorreant a more nostro ..." (VII, 23).

26 It should be noted that although Quintilian's remarks on paraphrase in Book X relate primarily to the rendering of Latin texts, an earlier discussion (I, ix, 2) describes the nuances of Greek-to-Latin paraphrase based on Aesop's fables. This dual use of paraphrase therefore confirms Jocelyn's findings outlined above (see n.24). Even the double form of paraphrase – literal and free – described by Giangrande ("On the Origins," p.153) is also formulated by Quintilian: "versus primo solvere, mox mutatis verbis interpretari, tum paraphrasi audacius vertere, qua et breviare quaedam et exornare salvo modo poetae sensu permittitur" (X, ix, 2). Since there is clearly no discrepancy between the statements of Books I and X, the later remarks on Latin-to-Latin paraphrase will apply with equal force to the paraphrase of Greek texts. Significantly, Robert Estienne confirms this reading for Renaissance scholars. In his *Dictionarium, seu Latinae linguae thesaurus* (Paris, 1531), he in no way asserts that paraphrase is a strictly Latin-to-Latin exercise, despite a direct citation from Quintilian's Book X: "Neque ego paraphrasim esse interpretationem tantum volo, sed circa eosdem sensus certamen atque aemulationem" (X, v, 5). Instead, he portrays the paraphrast simply as a translator "qui nõ literam ex litera, sed sensum è sensu trãsfert, quasi iuxta loquens" (vol. II, p.610). In his *Dictionarium Latinogallicum* (Paris, 1546), he defines "paraphrasis" as an "exposition et interpretation qui ne se fait point de mot pour mot, ains de sentence pour sentence" (p.905). Such is the notion of the ideal translator-paraphrast to be later taken up by Du Bellay.

27 While most late fifteenth and early sixteenth century French translations from poetic texts are verse-to-verse equivalents (see Larwill, *La Théorie,* p.41), there are occasional examples of prose version, the most notable being a combination verse-prose rendering of Terence which appeared at Paris between 1500 and 1503 (see Harold Lawton, *Térence en France au XVIe siècle* [Paris: Jouve, 1926], p.45). Even within the corpus of verse-to-verse translation, there is a theoretical split between the partisans of literalness ("mot à mot" and "vers pour vers") and looseness ("sentence pour sentence"). Towards 1530, the upsurge of French Ciceronianism and the oratorical vogue appear to weigh this opposition heavily in favor of the non-literalists. See Porcher, "La *Théologie naturelle,*" p.449.

28 See above, n.15.

29 See above, n.26. This definition is also born out by Charles Estienne in his translation of Terence's *Andria* (Paris, 1542): "[paraphraste] qui rend le sens, la phrase et l'esprit d'un matiere, sans contrainte du langaige"; and Du Bellay, *Deffence,* I:10.

30 This is not unlike Cicero's assertion in *De Finibus*: "equidem soleo etiam, quod uno Graeci, si

aliter non possum, idem pluribus verbis exponere" (III, iv, 15).

31 For other references to this dictum, see Lebègue, "Les traductions en France" (p. 364).

32 The difficulty of translating oratorical texts was already the principal concern of Colin in his prefaces to the *Paradoxes* and the *Songe de Scipio* (1538). *Les oeuures de M.-T. Cicero, père d'eloquence latine* (Paris, 1539).

33 Lebègue is undoubtedly correct in seeing here an attack by Dolet on such servile translators as Erasmus and Lazare de Baîf who attempted to render Greek tragedies "versum versui, verbum paene verbo" ("Les traductions en France," pp. 364-65). However, in his passing mention of the Horatian source for these words, he overlooks the more important treatments of Cicero and Quintilian. Furthermore, it is clear that like Cicero, Dolet makes specific reference to the servile translators of poetic texts who are content to render "vers pour vers" (16).

34 "verbis ad nostram consuetudinem aptis" (IV, v, 14); and in *De Oratore* (I, xxxiv, 155): "non solum optimis verbis uterer, et tamen usitatis."

35 Dolet is clearly attacking the same latinizing mania derided in Rabelais' parody of the "escholier Limosin" (*Pantagruel*: VI). Lebègue and others appear to accept Dolet's words as an unswerving rule which, in reality, is never followed by sixteenth century translators, even by Dolet himself. "Les traductions en France," p. 371.

36 "... sed etiam exprimerem quaedam verba imitando, quae nova nostris essent, dummodo essent idonea" (*De Oratore* [I, xxxiv, 155]).

37 For specific examples, see Dolet's Preface of Cicero's *Epistres familiaires* (Paris, 1542) and Lebègue, "Les traductions en France," for an in-depth treatment of the question. In *De Finibus* (III, iv, 15-16), Cicero treats the problem of converting Stoic terminology from Greek to Latin, concluding that a Greek form may sometimes be used where there is no Latin equivalent.

38 "En mon Orateur Françoys ie traicteray ce poinct plus amplement, et auec plus grand'-demonstration" (17).

39 Cf. Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, Book III; Cicero's *De Oratoria*, Book III passim; Quintilian, Book IX.

40 Cicero, for instance, reasons that the absence of word-for-word rendering frees the translator to transmit the stylistic values of his model text: "sed genus omne verborum vimque servavi" (*De Optimo Genere Oratorum* [IV, 14]). The well-cadenced phrase would certainly be among these stylistic values. For Quintilian, the function of poetic and oratorical paraphrase would undoubtedly call on the paraphrast to also convey certain metrical forms.

41 See Lazare de Baïf's Prologue to his version of Sophocles' *Electra* (Paris, 1537): "J'ay observé les nombres de ses mettres...." René Sturel is therefore mistaken in limiting its first importance to the period 1542-46. *Jacques Amyot*, p. 245.

42 Cf. Jacques Amyot's *Projet d'Eloquence royale*, Chapter 13 (n.d.); Antoine Foclin, *La Rhetorique françoise* (Paris, 1555); Omer Talon's *Rhetorica* (Paris, 1552), chapter 15 and 17; and an anonymous, incomplete treatise ("Precetti di rettorica scritti per Enrico III, re di Francia") written for Henri III and edited by Giulio Camus in *Memorie della Regia Academia di Modena* (1887). See also Sturel, *Jacques Amyot*, pp. 423-33.

43 Shortly before his remarks on translation in *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, Cicero makes a series of strikingly similar points: 1) on the propriety of diction: "Nam quoniam eloquentia constat ex verbis et ex sententiis, perficiendum est, ut pure et emendate loquentes ..."; 2) on the gravity of "sententia": "commovendi graves"; 3) on the role of "nombres": "Sed et verborum est structura quaedam duas res efficiens, numerum et levitatem"; 4) on the arrangement of "arguments": "et sententiae suam compositionem habent et ad probandam rem accommodatum ordinem"; 5) and finally, on the fusion of these qualities in the perfect orator: "Ea igitur omnia in quo summa erunt, erit perfectissimus orator" (II, 4-5).

John Knox and his Interpreters*

W. Stanford Reid

In his own day and age John Knox was a controversial figure, and he has continued to be so down to the present time. Until the beginning of the nineteenth century no one attempted to write a full-length biography of him, probably for this very reason. Yet from the early days of the Scottish Reformation men have taken a position either for or against the reformer, and have expressed their views both verbally and in writing. It has been the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, however, that have produced the greatest number of interpretations of this man. Despite the views of such historians as Professor Hugh Trevor Roper that he is not worth bothering about, more and more works are appearing either dealing directly with him, or referring to him in connection with other phases or personalities of the sixteenth century. Therefore, on the 400th anniversary of his death, it is perhaps a good thing to look at some of the interpretations to see if we can come to a just estimation of him and his work.

I

We may divide John Knox's interpreters into three different groups. The first consists of his supporters and advocates. Ever since the Reformation there have been those who believed that what he did was right, for he sought to serve God. As Richard Bannatyne, his servant at the time of his death, put it:

> What dexteritie in teiching, bauldness in reproving, and hatred of wickitnes was in him, my ignorant dulness is not able to declair; whilk gif I sould preis to set out, wer as who wald licht a candle to lat men sie the Sonne, seing all his vertowis ar better knowin, and nocht hid to the world, a thowsand fold better than I am able to express.[1]

And this sentiment has been echoed by many, including his first biographer, Dr. Thomas M'Crie and others, down to the present time. Some have been critical of his attitude towards Mary, Queen of Scots, and others have wished that he had not taken such a drastic stand against the sixteenth century's version of "Women's Lib," but generally they have felt that he was the right man for the right time in Scotland. Archbishop Spottiswoode even went to the length of denying his authorship of his *History of the Reformation in Scotland* in order to prove this point.[2] Indeed, many of his admirers have tended to see in him no fault at all.

Although Knox has had his admirers, he has had also had his violent opponents. As one might expect, Roman Catholics have always taken a somewhat dim view of him and his work. From his own days when Ninian Winzet and the Abbot of Grossraguel attacked him in print, even into the third quarter of the twentieth century in which Antonia Fraser in her biography of Mary, Queen of Scots, has drawn a very unfavorable picture of him, the attitude has been much the same. Others, however, who seem to have no religious commitments have also criticized him vigorously, usually on the ground of his attitude to Mary or for his violence in the denunciation of the opponents of his plans for reform. Not only did

William Maitland of Lethington in the sixteenth century oppose him on these grounds, but today we find much the same attitude in the opinions of contemporary historians and biographers, such as Professor Hugh Trevor Roper and Jasper Ridley.[3] This interpretation has become rather standard as the true and proper view of Knox and his work.

Again there have been those who have sought to take a middle position, neither condemning nor favoring Knox, but just seeing him as he was. Although few in his own day could adopt this stance, in more modern times some have attempted to do so. Prof. W. C. Dickinson of Edinburgh, the most recent editor of Knox's *History*, has been one of the most successful in this endeavour. Pierre Janton, the French historian and author of *John Knox, L'Homme at L'Oeuvre* and *Concept et Sentiment de l'Église Chez John Knox*, as well as Elizabeth Whitley and Geddes MacGregor, recent biographers, has also endeavoured to follow the same course.[4] But in most cases those who have sought thorough objectivity, have become indifferent or have joined either the advocates or the opponents of the Scottish Reformer. The indifferent, as in Knox's own day, are relatively few, while nearly all have become vigorous protagonists or antagonists.

The question then arises as to why Knox brings forth such strong feelings, either pro or con. No doubt one of the fundamental reasons is that he took a clear-cut religious and theological position with which one either agrees or disagrees. But there is also his general attitude on so many matters. Frequently both what he says and the way he says it so coincides or conflicts with our own thought and ways of expression that we tend to react strongly. We may feel that he says what we would like to hear said even in our own day, or we may so disagree with everything that he says and his way of expressing it that we cannot but reject him and his work completely. In both cases, however, it seems that to obtain a proper understanding of him it is necessary to look more closely at his own social and theological environment. Furthermore, we must seek to relate the experiences of the early part of his life with those of his later days in which many feel he became hard, spiteful and ruthless. At the same time, as Archbishop Spottiswoode pointed out, we must always recognize that he was but a man, or as Knox himself put it, a sinner in need of the grace of God in Jesus Christ.[5]

It is at this point that many of his biographers have failed. They have tended to apply to him the yard-stick of their own theological and cultural situation, demanding that he conform to their standards as though they were universally and eternally valid, while his were not. Therefore, in this lecture I wish to stress certain matters that I feel must be re-emphasized if we are to have a proper perspective on the man.

II

In seeking to understand Knox, probably one of the most important keys to his personality and to his work is that of his social background. He was raised in what one recent French biographer of Mary, Queen of Scots, has called "L'Ecosse Sauvage." He, himself, speaks of his homeland as if it were on the very edge of the world not only geographically but culturally. And there was some reason for such a point of view. Politically, Scotland had for many years been in a constant state of turmoil. From 1406 down to 1567 every Scottish monarch ascended the throne as a minor, the youngest being Mary, who became queen in

1541 at the age of one week. With no strong parliament or even efficient civil service, the outcome of this recurring situation was aristocratic factionalism, the leading nobles and their vassals constantly battling with each other over the regency, which would give them control of royal power and income. The best example of the result of this constant conflict was "Cleanse the Causway" in 1520 in which the Douglases cleansed the streets of Edinburgh of the Hamiltons, with a number of deaths on both sides.[6]

In such a situation it is little wonder that the church suffered spiritually. Owning at least half the real estate in the country, it was the constant prey of the nobility who, while hesitating to take over its property by *force majeure,* nevertheless succeeded in gaining control of much of its revenues by other means. One way was to intrude relatives into wealthy ecclesiastical positions, an activity at which both the monarchs as they grew up, and the nobility, were very adept. This, however, did not tend to ensure a high level of spirituality or morality among the members of the upper clergy, and they in turn, by virtue of their powers of nomination and provision to benefices lower in the hierarchy, usually appointed others like themselves. The outcome of this situation was that the Scottish clergy were a byword for their ignorance, their greed and their immorality. Consequently, they did little spiritually for the people over whom they were placed, especially the energetic, active element who might be termed the "middle" section of society: the burgesses of the town and the gentry of the countryside.

The burgesses formed a group made up of several elements: skilled artisans, professional men such as lawyers, and merchants. Although not very important in the preceding two or three centuries with the general intellectual and commercial revival taking place in Europe during the latter part of the fifteenth and early part of the sixteenth centuries, they were beginning to assume a place of unwonted consequence in Scottish society. Centred primarily on the east coast in burghs such as Edinburgh, Perth, Dundee and Aberdeen, and to a lesser extent on the west coast in Ayr, Kirkcudbright and even Glasgow, by their commercial and intellectual contacts abroad in the Low Countries, Germany and France, they were acquiring not only goods but new ideas and points of view. The result was that at home they were looking to the church for more than its services in mumbled Latin. When, therefore, the Reformation, first in its Lutheran and then in its Calvinistic form, spread to Scotland, they were among the earliest to give it a favorable hearing.[7]

The other element in this "middle" level of Scottish society was that of the gentry or lairds. Unlike the burgesses, they were not increasing in wealth but were in fact being pushed downwards owing to rising prices, fixed rents and escalating costs. Unlike the upper nobles, they could depend neither upon the wealth of the church nor positions at court to meet their financial needs. The only hope they had was to obtain assistance from the burgesses of the towns from whom they borrowed money; sometimes on the security of their lands and sometimes on the security of the marriage of a son or daughter. This development led to an alliance between the burgess and the laird in which the laird often came under the townsman's intellectual influence. At the same time, however, many of the gentry themselves spent a few years on the continent, either in pursuit of education or serving in the French army, where they, like the middle group in the towns, came in contact with the new ideas, particularly the teachings of Luther and Calvin which they then brought back home.[8]

The burgesses and lairds in the southern regions, however, had a special problem, for

they constantly faced the threat of English border raids. Consequently, the lairds in particular had to be constantly on the alert to protect themselves from their southern neighbors. Their situation was even more complicated when they became Protestant, for they were then caught between the upper millstone of the Scottish ecclesiastical and civil authorities who were prepared to take action against them for heresy, and the nether mill-stone of the English attacks. Only when England began to realize that these Protestant lairds might be allies because of their religion did they find much relief from their difficulties by becoming "assured" to the English invaders.[9]

This leads us on to one other constituent of Scottish society, the universities. Although small and rather provincial, the three universities: St. Andrews, Glasgow and Aberdeen, formed cells in which new ideas from the Continent were being discussed. Many Scots who had studied and often taught abroad returned home to take up teaching positions in their alma maters, bringing with them new ideas which they propounded to their students. Consequently, once the Reformation had begun to affect intellectual circles in Cologne, Paris and other cities, the new religious thought soon appeared in Scottish university circles. St. Leonard's College, St. Andrews University, in particular became well-known for its heretical tendencies; those embracing the Protestant doctrines often being accused of having "drunk at St. Leonard's well."[10]

It was the "middle" section of society, the burgesses, the lairds and the professionals, in particular which seems to have found its needs met by the Reformation teachings and which quickly came to form the core of the movement in Scotland. But what is important for our purposes is the fact that Knox came out of this type of background. Born and brought up in Haddington, lying just east of Edinburgh in East Lothian, he probably went to St. Andrews University for his education. Trained for the priesthood and also in Canon Law, he returned upon graduation to his own part of the country where he acted as a papal notary for the local gentry and also as a tutor for their sons. He thus had close contact with all these various groups in society which were being influenced by the new Protestant ideas. It was during this period of his life that he made his decision to take the step of rejecting the Roman Church and of accepting the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith, casting his anchor, as he said later, in the seventeenth chapter of John. When, therefore, he began to preach he spoke out of this context and to those who composed it. This is what made him so effective in dealing with those of "the middling sort," but also offensive to the aristocracy and particularly to Queen Mary, trained up in the refined, if hypocritical, atmosphere of the French court.[11]

III

A second key to an understanding of Knox is his sense of calling. Although he had taken minor orders in the Roman Church, it was not until he had heard the preaching of George Wishart and had known of his martyrdom in St. Andrews, that he may have had some sense of calling to take up Wishart's work. Even then, however, he was unwilling to move until he received a definite and outward summons by God to assume the office of a preacher. This came in St. Andrews, during the siege of the Castle occupied by Norman Leslie and his followers. Knox had joined them in the spring of 1547, because many of them were

Protestants and seemed to offer the one safe place in the country for those who were of this persuasion. Under the influence of John Rough, who was acting as the chaplain of the Castle, the congregation called Knox to become Rough's colleague. Although at first very reluctant to assume this office, partially perhaps through fear of the consequences, partially also because he doubted his own ability, he finally acceded to their request. And to his dying day, this sense of calling remained with him. The detail with which he describes the event some twenty years later in his *History*, shows the deep impression it made on him.[12] As God had summoned him through the congregation, he could not but obey.

His calling was to be a "painfull preacher of the Gospel." He did not seek to be either a writer or an ecclesiastical organizer or official. When his name was proposed for the position of a superintendent he refused, feeling that preaching in St. Giles Kirk was honor and responsibility enough. As he stated in his preface to one of the very few sermons that he ever published:

> For considering my self rather called of God to instruct the ignorant, comfort the sorrowfull, confirm the weak and rebuke the proud, by tongue and lively voice in these most corrupt days, than to compose books for the age to come, seeing that so much is written (and by men of most singular condition), and yet so little well observed; I declared to contain my self within the bounds of that vocation, whereunto I found my self especially called.[13]

Therefore, his main duty in life was, as he expressed it frequently, "to blawe my maister's trumpet." He saw himself as a preaching, rather than a writing prophet, for it was to the proclamation of the Gospel of God's grace in Jesus Christ that he had been called.

We must note, nevertheless, that during his lifetime his pen was continually in use, producing pamphlets, a history of the Reformation in Scotland and a large number of letters, which all told fill more than six thick octavo volumes. What he would have done had he felt called upon to write, is beyond imagination. At the same time, he was also a church organizer. It was largely under his inspiration and direction that the first *Book of Discipline* was prepared and employed within the church. He also played a large part in the preparation of the first Scots Confession. Then once the church had been established he filled an important role in the General Assembly, while also assisting the various superintendents to carry out their duties. He was a man of many parts who employed all his gifts in the service of Christ's church.

Preaching, however, was always his first and primary interest. For this reason he insisted that the preacher must have complete freedom to speak from the pulpit of God, directed by His Word and Spirit. Neither the civil government nor the universities had the right to tell him what he could or could not say. Only the courts of the church could interfere with him, and then only on the ground that he had contradicted the Scriptures. When Queen Mary suggested that if he had anything to say concerning her policies or actions he should come to her privately, he replied:

> I am called Madam, to a public function within the Kirk of God, and am appointed by God to rebuke the sins and vices of all. I am not appointed to come to every man in particular to show him his offence; for that labour were infinite. If your Grace please to frequent the public sermons, then doubt I not but that ye shall fully understand both what I like and mislike as well in your Majesty as in all others.

Later because of his attacks on the Hamiltons while in exile in St. Andrews, the university authorities sought to silence him, or at least have him modify his statements. To their demands he returned a flat refusal. He then wrote to the General Assembly admonishing them "above all things preserve the Kirk from the bondage of the universities." As he explained to the representatives of St. Andrews:

> The reason for my protestation is, that I look for no better regiment in times to come than has been in ages passing before us; in the which it is evident that universities, orders well established, and men raised up to defend the Kirk of God, have oppressed it; and the malice of Satan is always to be feared.[14]

He would speak as God by the Holy Spirit taught him through the Holy Scriptures.

IV

This brings us to a third element in his thinking: his source of authority. Coupled with his conviction that he had been called primarily to preach went his belief that the Bible is the Word of God and that it was his duty to expound it and apply to his hearers. Repeatedly, from the time of his first sermon in St. Andrews to the last day of his life, he reiterated this belief. While we may not always agree with his interpretations or applications, suspecting that at times his own personal feelings and situation entered into his thinking too fully, we have to admit that this was the firm persuasion which dominated his work as a reformer.

Although he may have known something of Luther's interpretation of the Scriptures, the real guide in his thinking was John Calvin. During his ministry in Berwick in 1550 he was studying Calvin's commentary on Jeremiah, and in 1563 he was asking friends in London to send him Calvin's latest edition of his *Institutes,* along with his recent re-issue of his commentary on Isaiah. It is not surprising, therefore, that he accepted both Calvin's views on Scripture and his interpretations. His reply to the Anabaptist attack on the doctrine of predestination shows this quite clearly. At times, however, he was prepared to go considerably farther than Calvin in carrying out arguments to their logical conclusions and in applying them to the contemporary scene.[15]

This appears most distinctly in his use of the Old Testament. Although he did not contemplate the establishment of an Old Testament theocracy in either England or Scotland, he did insist that a nation which had once made public profession of the Gospel had accepted a covenant with God similar to that of Israel with Jehovah. It therefore had the right to demand that its rulers see that this covenant was maintained, and if they failed in their duty the subordinate magistrates, or failing their action, the people themselves could remove the defaulting monarch. If the people refused to take such action, all they could expect was the condign punishment that God had brought upon Israel and Judah for their unfaithfulness. Basing his views on the actions of kings such as Joash and Josiah he insisted that England under Edward VI and Scotland under the parliament of 1560, came into this category.[16]

On this basis he constructed a political and social philosophy. He maintained that no woman by hereditary or man-made right could claim to reign over a country, although God in his wisdom – or in his wrath – might set up a female ruler. But he also asserted that

if an unbelieving ruler should attempt to persecute the church, or did not maintain justice and equity, that the people had the right to put him away.[17] Furthermore, as we see in a number of his letters and in the *Book of Discipline,* he constantly took the part of the poor, demanding that Christians should give to their help, and after 1560 that the state should devote part of the old church's lands to this purpose. Similarly, because of his belief in the rights and duties of the individual within the commonwealth, he advocated the establishment of a system of universal free education for all males capable of such training. All these ideas he believed were based on the guidelines laid out for society in Holy Writ.[18] Thus, the Bible was not merely "the right way to the Kingdom of Heaven," as set forth earlier by John Gau; it furnished a distinctive philosophy and life-style for Christians throughout the whole of life. Without an understanding of this aspect of Knox, he cannot but remain a mystery.

V

One other element in the understanding and interpretation of Knox which is so often omitted in the discussion of his activities in Scotland is the cumulative effect of his experiences in England and on the Continent prior to his return in 1559. They undoubtedly impressed him deeply, forming the background for much of his thought when faced with problems in Scotland.

His experience with the English brought him great disillusionment. When released from his slavery on the French war galley he had gone to England with high hopes for the future. He had worked hard in Berwick-on-Tweed and in Newcastle-on-Tyne to make the Reformation a reality in those areas. But he had soon found that even those political leaders who were supposed to be stalwarts in the movement were prepared to compromise their professed principles for their own profit. Moreover, Cranmer and Ridley were so insistent upon their liturgical formularies that they would go so far as to jail John Hooper, one of the staunchest Protestants, in order to enforce his conformity.[19] What was even worse, when Mary Tudor came to the throne in 1553, many of the nobles who had been valiant in the cause of the Reformation, such as Sir William Cecil, in order to keep their lands and their offices, submitted and conformed to re-established Romanism. Probably the hardest blow came, however, when in Frankfort the representatives of the Protestant refugees in Strasburg disrupted his congregation because he would not use the *Book of Common Prayer,* forcing him to leave by frightening the city council with some statements that he had made in a book written on behalf of the Protestant exiles.[20] Thoroughly disillusioned with the English, Knox retired to Geneva.

His experiences in France also played an important part in the development of his thought. Nineteen months in a French war galley as a slave could not but influence his outlook on both the Roman Catholic Church and upon the French "establishment." Neither a criminal nor a prisoner of war, he was illegally forced to serve in this capacity until through English intervention he was released. His sufferings came from the fact that he was a Protestant. Later he travelled through France on a number of occasions, and for a time even served as a co-minister in the French Reformed congregation in Dieppe. In this way he gained an understanding not only of the French language, but also of French society.

His knowledge of France also made him very fearful of French influence in Scotland. He had seen the Roman Catholic Church's persecution of the Protestants, and knew how deeply Queen Mary's family of Guise was involved in all of this. Furthermore, even after his return to Scotland he kept in close touch with the situation in France as the persecutions of the Huguenots increased in intensity and violence. For this reason he was very much afraid of what would happen if the young Queen had her way in Scotland. He believed that similar treatment, despite Mary's calls for mutual tolerance, would be meted out to Scottish Protestants. This would be but the first step to the overthrow of Elizabeth and the violent destruction of Protestantism in England. The Massacre of St. Bartholomew's Eve which took place in August of 1572 only confirmed his fears. Historians and biographers should keep all this in mind when they discuss his dealings with Queen Mary and his demands for the total suppression of the Mass.[21]

His French experience, however, was by no means entirely negative. Through his visits to such places as La Rochelle, Lyon and perhaps Poitiers and Châtelherault, he gained a first hand knowledge of the work and problems of the *Eglise Reformée.* Indeed, he may even have been involved in the drawing up of some of the French church's first confession and discipline. If this was the case, he would receive some introduction to problems which he would face when he returned to Scotland. To understand his attitudes and actions when he took up the spiritual leadership of the Scottish movement for reform, therefore, one needs to keep in mind the various influences exercised upon him by the situation in France.

Yet while we must recognize the impact of both France and England, undoubtedly Geneva made the greatest impression. Before he visited Geneva the first time, he had already read a considerable amount of Calvin's writings. When as minister of the English congregation he lived there for some two years, he came under the spell of what he called "the most perfect school of Christ."[23] Not only John Calvin, but also men such as Jean Crespin, the printer, Christopher Goodman, Knox's English colleague, and many others all played a part in his "education." Consequently, when he returned to Scotland in 1559 he carried back with him both the ideas and also documents such as Calvin's Genevan Catechism, probably the French church's *Confession de Foi et Discipline* and his own congregation's *Form of Prayers* to guide him in the organization and work of the new church to be founded in Scotland.

Experiences both positive and negative, therefore, must always be kept in mind as one seeks to understand John Knox.

VI

Finally, having sought to understand Knox's motivation, the drives that made him what he was, we must ask ourselves what he accomplished. We can touch on this subject only very quickly and lightly. Furthermore, how we regard his accomplishments, whether we regard them as "good things" or "bad things" will depend not so much on our research or even our understanding, as upon our agreement or disagreement with Knox's own theological position. Yet, although we may not accept his views entirely, we must admit that he had a great influence on Scotland; an influence which has lasted down to the present time and has been world-wide in scope. Let us look at this, then, in closing.

When he returned to Scotland in 1559 he faced what seemed to be overwhelming odds. On the political front he was opposed by the Queen Regent, Mary of Guise, backed by France one of the most powerful nations in the Europe of his day. With her stood a large and strong body of Scottish Roman Catholics. Moreover, as one might expect, she had the backing of the organized church with all its wealth and influence. On his side, it is true, there was a considerable force of Protestants, but most of them were of the "middling sort," without much power or influence. At the same time the Protestant forces were very much divided, since many so-called reformers seemed to be supporting reform simply for what they could pick up in terms of church lands. Nor could they depend upon the English as the Roman Catholics could on the French. Knox's task of attempting a reformation seemed hopeless.

Nevertheless, in the providence of God, although some would attribute it to other powers, he played an important part in strengthening the Protestants' morale, in giving them objectives and in welding their forces together in order that they might overcome. This he achieved not merely by his preaching or by personal persuasion but by his work as a churchman, helping to draw up the first Scots Confession and the first *Book of Discipline*. But probably even more important than these achievements, he succeeded in impressing on his supporters the fact that Christianity is something that applies to everyday life and living. His plans for the relief of poverty and his projected design of a universal system of education for the benefit of "the Commonwealth," show this clearly. His Christianity was not something that was for one day in the week but was to determine every aspect of life.

As we read the subsequent history of Scotland we can see that his ideas exercised a powerful influence on even those who did not agree with him, for they were affected by the climate of opinion of which he had been one of the originators. Robert Louis Stevenson, who was by no means a single-minded follower of the reformer, brings this out very clearly in his essay on "The Foreigner at Home":

> About the very cradle of the Scot there goes a hum of metaphysical divinity; and the whole of two divergent systems [English and Scottish] is summed up, not merely speciously, in the two first questions of the rival catechisms, the English tritely inquiring, "What is your name?" the Scottish striking at the very roots of life with, "What is the chief end of man?" and answering nobly if obscurely, "To glorify God and enjoy him forever." [24]

Whether we approve of John Knox or not, we have to admit that he did much to change and mould anew Scottish character. Largely through his bequest to subsequent generations, the Scots were, as even the English historian Trevelyan has stated, by 1700 one of the best educated peoples in Europe and have frequently been among the most radical in their ideas of democracy and social structure.[25]

This, however, has by no means been confined to Scotland, for the Scots have proven to be one of the most migratory peoples in human history. Poverty at home no doubt had much to do with this as well as many other factors, but wherever they have gone the same characteristics have manifested themselves, very frequently given physical visibility by the building of a Presbyterian church carrying the name of Knox. Knox's influence in this way continues and his "works do follow him."

Although some may not always approve of Knox's actions, and may even dislike him greatly they will have to admit that he was an important figure in history. He has wielded a very considerable influence not only in his own land, but across the world. Yet he accomplished what he did not by physical might or power, but because he believed sincerely that he was called by God to his role in life, and because he was able to communicate his ideas clearly and distinctly to those who heard him.

If more of Knox's interpreters had taken all the factors which I have mentioned into account we would find less tendency to adopt extreme attitudes with regard to him. His advocates would perhaps have admitted that he had some faults, while his violent critics would have understood him somewhat more clearly and not have condemned him as a pathological monster. They all might take his own estimate of himself a little more seriously when on his death bed he said:

> I know that many have complained much and loudly, and do still complain of my too great severity; but God knows that my mind was always free from hatred to the persons of those against whom I denounced the heavy judgments of God. In the mean time, I cannot deny but that I felt the greatest abhorrence at the sins in which they indulged; still, however, keeping this as the one thing in view, that if it were possible I might gain them to the Lord. But a certain reverential fear of my God, who called me, and was pleased of his grace to make me a steward of divine mysteries, to whom I knew I must render account, when I shall appear before his tribunal, of the manner in which I have discharged the embassy which he hath committed to me – had such a powerful effect as to make me utter so intrepidly whatever the Lord put into my mouth without any respect of persons. Therefore I profess before God and his holy angels, that I never made gain of the sacred word of God, that I never studied to please men, never indulged my own private passions or those of others, but faithfully distributed the talent intrusted to my care for the edification of the Church over which I did watch.[26]

University of Guelph

Notes

* In its original form this paper was delivered as the John Knox Memorial Lecture, November 24, 1972, at Knox College, Toronto. It is presented here in a revised text.

1 R. Bannatyne, *A Journal of the Transactions in Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1806), pp.429.

2 J. Spottiswoode, *History of the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1847), I, 375.

3 While Ridley commences his biography on a fairly objective note, once Knox becomes entangled in his conflicts with Mary, he turns against him, likening him to a jackal and bestowing various other epithets upon him. J. Ridley, *John Knox* (New York, 1968), chaps. XXII ff. Cf. also H. Trevor-Roper, "John Knox" *The Listener*, 80 (1968), 745f who, in his review of Ridley's work, is even more violent.

4 John Knox, *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, W. C. Dickinson, ed., (Edinburgh, 1949), I, Introduction; G. MacGregor, *The Thundering Scot* (Philadelphia, 1957); E. Whitley, *Plain Mr. Knox* (Richmond, Va., 1960).

5 Cf. Knox, *Works*, D. Laing ed. (Edinburgh, 1864), III, "Epistles to Mrs. Elizabeth Bowes and her daughter Marjorie."

6 For a more detailed description of Scotland at this time see W. C. Dickinson, *Scotland from the Earliest Time to 1603* (Edinburgh, 1961).

7 W. S. Reid, "The Middle Class Factor in the Scottish Reformation," *Church History*, XVI (1947) pp.137ff; Reid, "Lutheranism in the Scottish Reformation," *Westminster Theological Journal*, VII (1945), 91ff.

8 Reid, "The Lion Rampant in Sixteenth Century

France," *Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Scottish Studies* (Guelph, 1970), pp. 8ff.

9 M. H. Merriman, "The Assured Scots," *Scottish Historical Review*, XLVII (1968), 22ff.

10 Knox, *History*, I, 15.

11 Ridley, *op. cit.*, chap. II; Knox, *Works*, VI, 639. Cf. also his accounts of his interviews and debates with Mary and her courtiers in his *History*.

12 *History*, I, 84ff, 182.

13 *Works*, VI, 229.

14 *History*, II, 71ff; *Works*, VI, 619, 630.

15 As for instance in his views on the right of resistance to unjust rulers. *Ibid.*, IV, 261ff; V, 7ff.

16 *History*, II, 23, 115ff.

17 Cf. his "First Blast of the Trumpet" and also his summary of the proposed "Second Blast." *Works*, IV, 349ff, 539ff.

18 *History*, II, 295ff.

19 *Works*, IV, 36ff.

20 *Ibid.*, IV, 39.

21 *Ibid.*, III, 27-70, 212, 217.

22 Cf. W. S. Reid, "French Influence on the First Scots Confession and Book of Discipline," *Westminster Theological Journal*, XXXV (1972), 1ff.

23 *Works*, IV, 240.

24 R. L. Stevenson, "The Foreigner at Home," *Memories and Portraits* (London, n.d.), pp. 28ff.

25 G. M. Trevelyan, *A Shortened History of England* (London, 1942), p. 342.

26 *Works*, VI, 655.

The Revenger's Tragedy: A Play on the Revenge Play

Leslie Sanders

> What, brother? am I far enough from myself?
> As if another man had been sent whole
> Into the world, and none wist how he came.
> I. iii. 1-3

> Surely we are all mad people, and they
> Whom we think are, are not; we mistake those:
> 'Tis we are mad in sense, they but in clothes.
> III. v, 80-82

The principal issue of debate concerning *The Revenger's Tragedy*, aside from the question of authorship, appears to revolve around the problem of how seriously to take the play – and if one takes it seriously, how to ferret out its moral attitude. The confusion is caused in part by the plethora of elements the play draws from various dramatic traditions. *The Revenger's Tragedy* has what Bowers calls a "classic revenge plot in the Kydian tradition,"[1] but its characters assume the names and, at times, the roles of figures in a morality play. Blood abounds and the play ends in massacre, but its protagonist and many of his victims spend much of their time in farcical clowning. The language of the play evokes a sense of man as a creature led by his genitals to eternal damnation, yet at least one critic[2] finds the play evokes sardonic mirth rather than pity or terror and several others see, in the same play, a stern sermon on final judgment.[3]

One element of the play no critic has emphasized, though many have noted it in passing.[4] *The Revenger's Tragedy* is self-consciously and insistently theatrical. From the opening lines which introduce, in procession, the "four excellent characters" to take part in the tragedy, to the final enactment of all the revenges, which occurs during what is in itself an entertainment, a masque, the play insists on itself as play. If we consider its theatrical dimension, the play emerges as both a black parody of that highly popular form of renaissance entertainment, the revenge play itself, and as a profound examination of the implications of the genre's immense popularity. *The Revenger's Tragedy* both burlesques the genre and examines its attraction.

The play's theatricality emerges in several forms. There are explicit references to the theatrical nature of the activity on stage through comments to the audience, through the use of plays within the play, through echoes from other revenge plays, especially Shakespeare's *Hamlet*. The drama is enacted in a circumscribed world, that of the court introduced to the audience by Vindice's opening soliloquy – a world which Schoenbaum describes as shining "with artificial brightness."[5] The extreme complexity of the plot emphasizes the artificiality of this world. Everything that occurs in the play is possible, but barely possible. However, the overriding metaphor of the play, which is its chief dramatic device and the obsession of its protagonist, emphasizes the theatricality and intensifies its impact. As Murray notes,[6] the notion of metamorphosis is everywhere in the play: it is apparent linguistically in the form of puns and metaphors concerning transformation and dramatically in the extended use of disguise. *The Revenger's Tragedy* is about a man who

both exploits and fears the notion of disguise, who adopts a role and then permits it to control him until he literally loses himself in it. Vindice, the character, puts on the role of revenger, of malcontent, of pander. The actor puts on the role of Vindice. The audience assumes the world projected by the play in coming to see and to applaud it.

In his opening speech, Vindice establishes the scenario, much as the stage manager does in Wilder's *Our Town. The Revenger's Tragedy* opens as Vindice's play.

> From his cry "be merry" in his opening speech, he clowns, exercises his wit in tricks and quibbles, and guides our appreciation of what happens by his satiric remarks, or mocking comments. Of course, he is involved too in his devices, to the point of rejoicing in his skill and losing sight of their horror and evil.... But the fact that he sees the action as macabre, even funny at times, and the characters as mad, helps to control our view of the play's events, and ensure that we do not mistake what we see for an illusion of reality.[7]

At several points, characters make explicit reference to the play's theatricality. After disclosing to Hippolito Spurio's liaison with the Duchess and Lussurioso's designs on Castiza, Vindice remarks that were all night-time activities revealed, few would escape without blushing. In the course of his revenge, Vindice exposes several "night-time activities" and Foakes suggests that the audience is implicated by the comment.[8]

The second explicit reference to theatricality concludes what critics agree is the central speech in the play: the meditation on mortality in III. v. The speech ends:

> Surely we are all mad people, and they
> Whom we think are, are not; we mistake those:
> 'Tis we are mad in sense, they but in clothes.
> III. v. 80-82

Within the context of the speech, these lines suggest that we, lusting humanity, lust ultimately after death since death is the inevitable outcome of our lives and loves. Who are they who are mad in clothes? On the literal level, they are those wearing the garb of the madman. The lines also suggest the device and metaphor of disguise in the play and become a plaintive cry from the man who pursues his "legitimate" revenge against the Duke in disguise and then drops his costume as Piato in the course of cutting off the heads of the rest of the court.

> 'Twas our friend indeed.
> 'Tis state in music for a duke to bleed:
> The dukedom wants a head, though yet unknown;
> As fast as they peep up, let's cut 'em down.
> III. v. 223-226

Moreover, on the theatrical level, those wearing disguise are the actors and it is they who merely appear mad, while it is the audience who is mad in sense – possibly revealing its madness in coming to the theatre to applaud the fantasy offered, i.e., the play.

The sense of the last suggestion emerges from the realization that the entire scene (III. v.) assumes the shape of Vindice's play within the play.

Then I'll divide it to thee: the old duke,
Thinking my outward shape and inward heart
Are cut out of one piece (for he that prates
His secrets, his heart stands o' th' outside),
Hires me by price to greet him with a lady
In some fit place, veil'd from the eyes o' th' court,
Some darken'd, blushless angle, that is guilty
Of his forefathers' lusts, and great folks' riots;
To which I easily (to maintain my shape)
Consented, and did wish his impudent grace
To meet her here in this unsunned lodge,
Wherein 'tis night at noon; and here the rather,
Because unto the torturing of his soul,
The bastard and the duchess have appointed
Their meeting too in this luxurious circle,
Which most afflicting sight will kill his eyes
Before we kill the rest of him.

III. v. 8-24

The structure of the scene is that of a multi-level peep-show. Foakes suggests that the circle alludes to the canopy over the stage; i.e., that the magic circle within which revenge is to be enacted is the theatre itself. The language in this scene implies an orgy and to watch is to become a voyeur. Vindice employs the skull of Glorianna as prop in his drama – he makes explicit reference to its costume in lines 99-102. However, he is not content with merely the play (the revenge) within the play (his disguise as Piato) within the play (*The Revenger's Tragedy*). Vindice arranges yet another play for the Duke. The audience, the revengers and the Duke will observe the Duchess commit incest and adultery with the Duke's bastard son, Spurio.

The same voyeuristic implications occur in I. iv.; the scene concerns another group of revengers. When Antonio invites Hippolito and some other Lords to join in his mourning for his wife, he promises to "cut/Long grief into short words." (I. iv. 25-6) He continues with a lengthy, graphic, emotional, titillating description of the rape of his wife that contrasts sharply with the stoicism of his earlier exchange with Hippolito. The speech is followed by the swearing on swords which, the editor notes, may have been suggested by *Hamlet*, I. v.[9] Antonio's recital is closely linked with Vindice's later speech in III. v. Vindice's begins with an explanation of how his disguise enabled him to entice the Duke into coming to the assignation; Antonio's explains that the masque at which the rape occurred gave an opportunity to the courtiers to "[put] on better faces than their own,/Being full of fraud and flattery ..." (I. iv. 29-30) Vindice describes an "unsunned lodge/Wherein 'tis night at noon," in which torchlight will act as spotlight on the liaison between Spurio and the Duchess; Antonio notes that the night of the masque, "torchlight made an artificial noon/About the court ... (I. iv. 26-27). During Antonio's speech, characters and audience view an actual rape through the speaker's eyes. During Vindice's, both the audience and the characters observe the fornication of Spurio and the Duchess and the symbolic rape of the dead Glorianna.

This kind of hyperbole occurs again in IV. ii. where, through an inordinate number of

asides, principally spoken by Hippolito, the author seems to insist upon the play's cleverness and theatricality. The scene is the encounter between Lussurioso and Vindice who has come to the court under his own name but "disguised" as malcontent. Vindice evokes for Lussurioso the picture of "[a] usuring father to be boiling in hell, and his son and heir with a whore dancing over him." (IV. ii. 88-89) Lussurioso disregards that part of the image relating to himself and rejects the picture, arguing that rich men would find it offensive. He responds with another kind of picture, a lie. Lussurioso demands that Vindice kill Piato because the latter has pandered Vindice's sister. He could easily have told the "truth" - that by giving him false information, Piato had almost cost him his life. He does not do so for the same reason that Antonio paints such a graphic picture of his wife's downfall. In *The Revenger's Tragedy,* Tourneur insists that to become an avenger, a murderer, a man must have a personal stake in the matter; he demonstrates that the nature of that stake is finally ambiguous. Antonio's colleagues share his grief and horror. For Vindice, the situation is more complex and the ambiguity is explored in a dramatic conceit. Vindice must avenge a matter of family honour that he, himself (in disguise), has violated. The conceit explodes when Lussurioso demands that Vindice kill Piato, i.e., himself. The audience, in the position of co-plotters, become caught up in Vindice's machinations in a manner frequent in Jonson's plays. Vindice carries the audience with his wit, glee and energy until the audience, like the protagonist, wake to find they too have lost themselves.[10]

The artificiality of the plot emphasizes the play's deliberateness. Four sets of revengers tangle in *The Revenger's Tragedy*; each reflects upon the other's activities. Vindice and Hippolito are doubly revengers: they pursue the Duke in their own cause and Piato for Lussurioso. Spurio avenges himself upon his father by cuckolding him, and actually kills him by this act, for the Duke dies upon seeing Spurio and his wife together. The parallels between Spurio and Vindice are insisted upon, most obviously when Vindice exploits and complete's Spurio's vengeance in III. v. in the course of pursuing his own. An important link between the two occurs through the motif of the bastard. Spurio becomes an avenger because he is a bastard and thus has no clear title to the kingdom. A bastard is one of uncertain origin and it is suggested that the man in disguise is analogous:

> What, brother? am I far enough from myself?
> As if another man had been sent whole
> Into the world, and none wist how he came.
>
> I. iii. 1-3

By making his mother a bawd, Vindice also makes himself a bastard - and his sister and brother become the same.

> I cry you mercy, lady, I mistook you;
> Pray, did you see my mother? Which way went she?
> Pray God I have not lost her....
> Why, are you she?
> The world's so chang'd, one shape into another,
> It is a wise child now that knows her mother!
>
> II. i. 161-3, 165-7

Antonio heads the third set of avengers. He desires to avenge the rape of his wife, but

the matter is taken out of his hands by the machinations of the protagonist and the fourth set of avengers, who emerge as complete bumblers: Ambitioso and Supervacuo. The latter become avengers over a death they themselves caused by failing to specify which of the Duke's sons (Lussurioso or Junior Brother) was to be executed. Their thoughts of vengeance are directed at no one in particular (III. vi. 91-94). Ironically, they enact their "revenge" appropriately. During the indiscriminate sword play of the final masque, they murder each other in their scramble for power.

Finally, the Duchess is a kind of revenger: she plans to seduce Spurio in order to punish the Duke for his reluctance to pardon her youngest son.

The impact of this plethora of avengers with any and every motive for revenge is primarily comic. Revenge degenerates from the solemn summoning to justice, so graphically portrayed by Vindice in the opening scene of the play, to a ready excuse for murder. But the language of the play considerably darkens the comedy, as we will see. Moreover, the confusion among the characters dramatically reflects the essentially serious treatment of Vindice's own loss of purpose and of self.

Tourneur's parody of the revenge play becomes obvious also in specific twists of plot. Perhaps the best, most complex and darkly comic occurs in Act II. The time is night and several fornications are plotted. Almost all the revengers appear in pursuit of one another. Lussurioso informs Vindice/Piato that he is off to consummate his lust for Castiza. Vindice realizes that he must protect his sister, but does not wish to reveal his disguise and prefers to confront Lussurioso openly. He deflects Lussurioso by informing him that he has seen Spurio departing for an assignation with the Duchess. In fact, Spurio intended to take Lussurioso in Castiza's bed (thus enacting the revenge Vindice ought to have been planning but, of course, for reasons of his own.) Lussurioso surprises the Duchess with her bed partner only to discover he is the Duke and ends in jail for his effort to redeem the family honour. All the evening's plots misfire and the only resulting death is the inadvertent execution of Junior Brother. The confusion of characters and activities suggests not only parody of the complexities of the typical revenge plot, but also a confusion of revenge motives. Spurio assumes Vindice's revenge pursuit and Lussurioso chooses to act "righteously" towards the wrong victim.

The manner in which Tourneur burlesques the revenge play is not, however, primarily farcical. An examination of the language of the play reveals the darker side of the satire. There are very few lines in *The Revenger's Tragedy* that do not permit of sexual interpretation. This reduction of all matters to a sexual level creates the play's dominant atmosphere and meaning and suggests that the popularity of the tradition implies a prurience in its audience as well as an ambivalence in the motivation of the avenger. The levelling device is the notion of lust – for sex, for power, for gold, for blood – almost a commonplace in mediaeval and renaissance language, but carried to an extreme in *The Revenger's Tragedy.* An examination of I. i. will reveal how the language functions.

The opening tableau, Vindice, skull in hand, watching the Duke and his family parade below, has often been cited for its brilliance. While its visual impact is sparsely escatological, the luxuriant language of the opening speech undercuts the bare visual impact. The first thirteen lines indicate that the motivating energy of that "marrowless age" is lust itself and that the frustration of the avenger is of like fire.

O, that marrowless age
Would stuff the hollow bones with damn'd desires,
And 'stead of heat, kindle infernal fires
Within the spendthrift veins of a dry duke,
A parch'd and juiceless luxur.

I. i. 5-9

The similarity of the first part of this speech to the introduction of figures in a morality play has been used by several critics[11] to argue that the play *is* basically a morality play. There are alternative interpretations. It is the specificity of the first part of this speech that is important: these four characters, this age, this avenger, this palace, the procession spotlighted with torches. Both visually and verbally, a constrained arena of action, a particular dramatic schema and situation are presented to the audience. The personification of the morality play opens out to suggest cosmic dimensions. The movement of the opening soliloquy of this play is one which defines the limits of a situation, a bounded world in which lust and revenge will tangle and maim each other.

When Vindice turns to the "sallow picture of my poison'd love," he reveals that what he had admired in the dead Glorianna was her beauty, a visage whose main virtue seems to have been its power to tempt men to sin. Given the premises of the first part of the speech, it is not surprising that in "this marrowless age" beauty is defined by its ability to seduce, and the effect of Vindice's paean to his dead mistress is to place him firmly in the world he has delineated.

The recurrent equation between sex and money begins also in this speech.

O, she was able to ha' made a usurer's son
Melt all his patrimony in a kiss,
And what his father fifty years told,
To have consum'd, and yet his suit been cold.

I. i. 26-29

The monetary equation is extended in the castigation of old men who "outbid like their limited performances," and is made explicit in the *sententia* that ends the passage: "Age, as in gold, in lust is covetous."

The last part of the speech introduces another major theme. The monetary metaphor first applied to sex and women is next applied to vengeance, "murder's quit-rent," and then the feminine metaphor is extended to Revenge: "Faith, give Revenge her due,/Sh' has kept touch hitherto – be merry, merry ..." (I. i. 43-44) Thus the three major concerns of the play are linked: lust for women has been equated with lust for gold and lust for blood. Revenge is termed feminine in this clearly misogynist drama and even the opportunity for revenge constitutes a rape of that Bald Madam. (I. i. 54, 99-102) We learn that Hippolito's place at court is in the Duke's chamber, a place he maintains by holding on to the Duchess' skirts ("Whom such a coat keeps up can never fall flat." (I. i. 64)) and that he is on an errand to seek a pander for Lussurioso, who is so lecherous that he will stop at nothing short of a corpse. The scene ends with the decision to "coin" both mother and sister – meaning, on the literal level, to deceive, but in terms of the play having also specifically sexual connotations, since Vindice will attempt to seduce both of them.

The first scene also reduces law to a sexual level. "The law is a woman," Vindice tells his sister, "and would she were you." (I. i. 115) The feminizing of both law and vengeance in a play whose energies are primarily sexual seems to imply that the drive for justice bears analogy to baser impulses. The world might be a better place if Castiza held the scales, but in this play, it is clearly the Duchess who does so. (I. ii.) Moreover, the statement is ironic since in his pursuit of justice, Vindice will pursue his sister.

The debate in I. ii. elaborates the justice theme. Junior Brother boasts of his rape of Antonio's wife. The Duchess begs for mercy which, Lussurioso suggests, has the seductive glitter of women, "good only for their beauties, which wash'd off, no sin is uglier." (30-31) Her plea is ineffectual until she takes a "woman's revenge": "O what it is to have an old-cool duke/To be as slack in tongue as in performance." (74-75) His virility attacked, the Duke immediately accedes and postpones judgment. The seductive power of law is again made explicit when Lussurioso counsels Junior Brother: "The law is a wise serpent, /And quickly can beguile thee of thy life." (50-51) The scene anticipates II. iii. in which Ambitioso and Supervacuo pretend to plead for Lussurioso's life with so little guile that the Duke remarks: "Here's no stepmother's wit;/I'll try them both upon their love and hate." (88-89) The wit of the law is the wit of a woman, her power of seduction.

O,
Were't not for gold and women, there would be no
damnation; Hell would look like a lord's great kitchen
without fire in 't:
But 'twas decreed before the world began,
That they should be the hooks to catch at man.
II. i. 256-261

Vindice's outrage against women, his response to his success at seducing his mother, resonates against all those ideas and activities feminized in *The Revenger's Tragedy.*

The drive for power is also sexually motivated. This becomes obvious, both visually and verbally, in the Duke's response to Lussurioso's mistaken attack in II. iii.

This boy, that should be myself after me,
Would be myself before me; and in heat
Of that ambition, bloodily rush'd in,
Intending to depose me in my bed.
(20-23)

Displacement in power as displacement in bed is further suggested by the activities of Spurio who avenges himself against his father in the Duchess's bed.

Principal relationships in the play are delineated by sexual metaphors. Vindice's first words to Lussurioso are:

With all my heart, i'faith; how dost, sweet musk-cat?
When shall we lie together?
I. iii. 33-34

Lussurioso's language to Vindice is explicitly that of the feminine partner in a sexual encounter: "sfoot, the slave's/Already as familiar as an ague,/And shakes me at his pleasure."

(38-39) He parallels the words of Gratiana in begging the results of Vindice's mission, "Ravish me in thine answer; art thou rare?" (II. ii. 21) In the language used to describe Lussurioso's hiring of Vindice, the sexual tables are turned, as Lussurioso gives him money with the words, "And thus I enter thee." (I. iii. 84)

The interchangeability of roles delineates one of the modes of metamorphosis in the play. Not only roles, but also people are interchangeable. Hippolito notes this (II. ii. 14-16) and his brother concurs (IV. i. 35ff). The two brothers substitute for each other when the plot necessitates. In the final masque, when all are disguised, the notion of disguise and substitution becomes visually hyperbolic: everyone is killed and it hardly matters who is responsible – as Antonio's execution of the "Fourth Noble" clearly indicates.

If passion for vengeance is a sexual urge, then sexuality underlies the relation of each revenger to his victim, each person seeking power to his competitors, as well as each seducer to the object of his seduction. Even the conversion of Gratiana has sexual overtones. She succumbs at sword-point and her contrition is met with the response from her sons, "then we'll marry her" – the caveat, "albeit to our souls wherein there is no lust," a highly problematical statement at this point in the play.

The equation between the acts of rape and of revenge is also made specific in the structure of scenes and speeches that relate to midnight activities and to masques. The rape of Antonio's wife occurred at a midnight masque. The scene closely parallels the murder of the Duke, which constitutes, as noted above, both rape and murder, and the last masque is the final masque, in which all the revengers come together, indistinguishable from one another in their disguises. In each scene there is a distinctive twist. Antonio's wife is raped at midnight, the hour specifically devoted to sexual encounters (cf. I. iii. 66-70), though the night is lighted as though it were noon. The Duke is killed at noon in the atmosphere of midnight and the play closes at night and in a carnage of death, final night.

Furthermore, the pleasure Vindice enjoys both from his machinations and his malcontentish railings is explicitly orgiastic. In response to his area on the lechery of night, Hippolito commends, "You flow well, brother." (II. ii. 146) The scene containing the destruction of the Duke opens with Vindice's ravings: "O sweet, delectable, rare, happy, ravishing." (III. v. 1)

The motif of appearance and reality, of disguise, also has sexual overtones – and these touch all Vindice's forays into costume.

> O, hour of incest!
> Any kin now, next to the rim o' th' sister,
> Is man's meat in these days; and in the morning,
> When they are up and dress'd, and their mask on,
> Who can perceive this? – save that eternal eye,
> That sees through flesh and all. Well, if anything
> Be damn'd, it will be twelve o'clock at night,
> That twelve will never 'scape;
> It is the Judas of the hours, wherein
> Honest salvation is betray'd to sin.
> (I. iii. 61-70)

The speech is ironic in the mouth of Vindice, who does not stop at the rim of his sister –

he rationalizes his act as pander by saying, essentially, "better me than someone else." (I. iii. 178-185) He notes that the main impact of disguise is that it hides evil while he himself stands in disguise before Lussurioso. He introduces the notion that only the Lord can see truth to the bone – an interesting comment because it is his own obsession.

At this point we can begin to discuss the role of the overriding visual metaphor of the play – the skull of Glorianna.[12] Most critics attribute to the presence of the skull much of the burden of the moral impact of the play. Essentially, they argue that the corrupt activities and language of *The Revenger's Tragedy* occur within an escatological framework so that the impact of the play is that of the *danse macabre* or a mediaeval sermon with plentiful illustrations of the vices it condemns. But the skull appears always in the hands of Vindice, who is far too enmeshed and confounded by the webs he spins to be a fitting bearer of the sign of final judgment. What he does, in fact, is to employ the skull in his own drama. He dresses it, panders for it, allows the Duke to violate it, and then, its usefulness at an end, permits it to disappear (unless the careless treatment afforded the head of Junior Brother in the scene directly following Glorianna's last appearance is intended as mindful of her presence and fate). The role of the Four Last Things, symbolized by the skull and the summoned thunder in the last act, are far too orchestrated to be taken with absolute seriousness.

Those characters who symbolize virtue in *The Revenger's Tragedy* lack the stature of morality play personifications of goodness and the play treats them ironically. An examination of the scenes in which Castiza appears reveals that she is, indeed, dull, as Vindice comments. She says little; she displays her outrage most potently in the form of a slap, and that anger she herself describes as "passing the virgin limits of myself." (II. i. 32) There is little in the text to prevent an actress from interpreting her character as both vixen-like and "chaste." Even her response to her mother's betrayal has a precise, brittle quality:

> It is a pretty saying of a wicked one,
> But methinks now
> It does not show so well out of your mouth,
> Better in his.
>
> (II. i. 175-8)

The cadence is in marked contrast to the speeches of Vindice and the response of Gratiana. The second time Castiza appears her actions have both a comic and a dangerous impact. No sooner has her mother undergone a melodramatic repentance than Castiza enters to say she will comply with her mother's request. It is a macabre joke at this point in the play for disguise of any kind has acquired terrifying connotations.

The character of Antonio is also carefully undercut. We know little about him, but one bit of information, slyly included at the end of I. iv., is interesting in itself.

> That is my comfort, gentlemen, and I joy
> In this one happiness above the rest.
> Which will be call'd a miracle at last!
> That, being an old man, I'd a wife so chaste.

There is much comment about the sexual failings of old men in *The Revenger's Tragedy*

and nothing to suggest that Antonio's wife was an old woman. Antonio acquires something of the stature of a January who has lost his May. The more obvious problem with Antonio as an ordering figure is that he too is an avenger, but one who practices continence, for when the objects of his revenge are done away with, he feels no compulsion to go on to others. Thus his reason for executing Vindice and his brother: – "You that would murder him would murder me." (V. iii. 105) – is both ironic and hypocritical.

The manner in which *The Revenger's Tragedy* both spoofs and satirizes the revenge play tradition is obvious. The play includes all the characteristics of the classic revenge plot except the presence of a ghost (for which the skull may serve as substitute); the author uses every twist of the revenge plot and then deliberately and gleefully adds another turn of the screw. The protagonist himself is conscious of the elegance of his machinations – and of the extent to which his language succeeds in dragging all actions and characters to the common denominator of that least dignified of human vices.

That the play is deliberately theatrical ought also be obvious. The effect of the play is to indicate clearly to the audience the nature of the experience in which they are engaged when they take pleasure in the kinds of activities that occur on the stage during a play of blood revenge. The principal indication occurs during the climax of the play, the murder of the duke, and the scene resonates throughout the drama.

But the play is entitled a *tragedy.* In what manner does it acquire the sense of tragedy prevalent in the form it burlesques? How seriously *are* we to read the play? If the play is a meditation upon the meaning of the genre, what meaning has the playwright discovered? Formally, there are two elements that place the play within a tragic structure. The plot concerns the fall of a man tormented by the corruption he sees around him, who risks himself in the attempt to "set it right." Since the murder Vindice avenges is the murder of his betrothed, and since the murderer is the Duke, there is some "justification" for his revenge; the law of the land lies in the hands of the murderer. Alvin Kernan argues that Vindice's knowledge that he *must* die at the end of the play constitutes an "attenuated tragic recognition."[13] "'Tis time to die, when we are ourselves our foes." (V. iii. 1110) Vindice has accomplished his purpose and sacrificed himself in the process. This is the pattern of almost all revenge plays: the decision to bring justice into the world is always at the cost of one's own life. But the presence of this tragic structure does not account for the play's impact.

The serious impact of *The Revenger's Tragedy* emerges from a study of the protagonist. The fecundity of his imagination is awesome and when that imagination manages, in III. v., to translate its vigor into action, into tangible activity on stage, both the play and its protagonist touch on madness. Ornstein writes that Vindice is "aroused and revolted not by what is seen, but by what is imagined.... He is the Peeping Tom turned moralist."[14] To query the serious aspects of Vindice's character is to ask the question, what does Tourneur say about the process of becoming a revenger?[15]

What the revenger does is to put on or assume the tragedy of another and to make it his own. The tragedy that Vindice assumes is the tragedy of Glorianna, who, nine years previous to the opening of the play, chose death over loss of innocence. A kind of equation is established between Glorianna's death and the process Vindice undergoes in avenging it.

> O!
> Now let me burst; I've eaten noble poison.
> We are made strange fellows, brother, innocent villains;
> Wilt not be angry when thou hear'st on 't, think'st thou?
> I'faith, thou shalt.
>
> I. iii. 168-172

That the journey towards becoming an avenger involves a journey away from self is the most insistent theme in the play. Vindice's use of disguise results finally in the need to kill first the disguise and then to allow or accept his own death. Although Vindice thoroughly enjoys the complications resulting from the path he has chosen, early in the play he experiences moments of terrible understanding of what it is he is doing. These are echoed later in Hippolito's cry, "Brother, we lose ourselves." (IV. ii. 199) Vindice's journey is a journey into madness in the sense that he creates an alter-ego to perform his revenge and then abandons himself to that alter-ego and loses all grasp on himself – until the end of the play in which he realizes that he has become his own enemy. The anguish underlying the process is carefully controlled and remains undercurrent to the satirical elements of the play. But it is this that gives the play its gruesome and terrifying dimensions.

In his essay *King Lear* or *Endgame*, Jan Kott writes:

> The world of tragedy and the world of grotesque have a similar structure. Grotesque takes over the themes of tragedy and poses the same fundamental questions. Only its answers are different. This dispute about the tragic and grotesque interpretations of human fate reflects the everlasting conflict of two philosophies and two ways of thinking ... the irreconcilable antagonism between the priest and the clown. Between tragedy and grotesque there is the same conflict for or against such notions as eschatology, belief in the absolute, hope for the ultimate solution of the contradiction between moral order and every-day practice. Tragedy is the theatre of priests, grotesque is the theatre of clowns.[16]

Is Vindice a priest, for the task of the revenger is a priestly task: the calling of men to judgment? Or is he a clown, a Yippie, making "revolution for the hell of it"? Or does he begin as one and end as the other?

Tourneur certainly suggests that the genre purports to satisfy the audience's sense that justice can be accomplished in an unjust world, but that in fact it satisfies the craving for a vicarious outlet for baser emotions of lust and uncontrolled anger. He also suggests that man is not a competent instrument of judgment– not because vengeance is the Lord's – but rather because none of his motivations and actions are pure. The calling to justice is too apt to degenerate into a game of cat and mouse, played for lust of the hunt. There is also the darker suggestion that to set the world right, or to attempt to do so, is to risk madness. Revenge plays become an outlet for man's illusion that he can do so. In this play, the fantasy about setting the world right becomes a cruel trap for its audience. The play is *both* gruesome *and* hilarious; it seduces the audience into an awareness of its zest for the horrible, and into applauding what it cannot condone in itself.

University of Toronto

Notes

1 Fredson Bowers, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy 1587-1652* (Princeton, 1940), p.132.

2 Samuel Schoenbaum, *Middleton's Tragedies* (New York, 1970), p.23.

3 See Peter Lisca, "*The Revenger's Tragedy:* A Study in Irony," in Max Bluestone and Norman Rabkin, eds., *Shakespeare's Contemporaries: Modern Studies in English Renaissance Drama* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1970), pp.307-317; L.G. Salingar, "*The Revenger's Tragedy* and the Morality Tradition," in R. Kaufmann, ed., *Elizabethan Drama: Modern Essays in Criticism* (New York, 1961), pp.208-224; L. G. Salingar, "Tourneur and the Tragedy of Revenge," in Boris Ford ed., *The Age of Shakespeare* (Harmondsworth, 1962), pp.334-354; Peter Murray, *A Study of Cyril Tourneur* (Philadelphia, 1964).

4 See Richard Barker, *Thomas Middleton* (New York, 1958), and Samuel Schoenbaum, *Middleton's Tragedies.*

5 Schoenbaum, p.13.

6 p.190.

7 Cyril Tourneur, *The Revenger's Tragedy,* R. A. Foakes, ed. The Revels Plays (London, 1966), p.xliii. All textual references are to this edition.

8 Foakes, p.xxviii, n.1.

9 There are several points in the play at which *Hamlet* is deliberately echoed. In I.ii. when Lussurioso demands that Vindice swear secrecy, the deliberate repetition of the word, "swear" (160-167) recalls the echo of the ghost's voice as the conspirators swear secrecy in Shakespeare's play. Vindice's complaint that his "life's unnatural to me" (I. i. 120) since his father's funeral is another such echo. The notion of the revenger/malcontent applies to Hamlet, Vindice and Spurio and the latter two may be variants on the former. The conversion scene of Gratiana recalls that of Gertrude and Vindice's silkworm speech may be meant to suggest Hamlet's meditation upon the skull of Yorick.

10 Jonson often plays with his audience in this manner. The applause at the end of *Epicoene* forces the audience to partake in the torture of Morose. It is the figure of Volpone who requests the applause at the end of that play and the prologue of *Bartholomew Fair* spells out the nature of the audience's relation to the play in the form of a contract which the audience in effect signs by coming to the play; its signature becomes its assent to the activities on stage.

11 Especially L. G. Salingar.

12 The choice of name for the skull suggests a reference to Elizabeth I.

13 Alvin Kernan, "Tragical Satire and *The Revenger's Tragedy,*" in *Shakespeare's Contemporaries,* p.327.

14 Robert Ornstein, *The Moral Vision of Jacobean Tragedy* (Madison, 1960), p.109.

15 In his article, "Hamlet, Duellist" (*University of Toronto Quarterly* XXXIX, no. 1 (1969) pp.9-18) Sheldon Zitner examines *Hamlet* as an investigation into the adequacy of the duelling code (and ultimately any human code) for dealing with the ultimate questions of self and place in the world. He argues that the question was of some importance during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century not only because duelling activities had assumed alarming proportions in England but also because adherence to the code posed those questions that surround imminent death. Both Bowers and Lawrence Stone (*The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641* (Oxford, 1965), pp.242-250) provide evidence of the social and political magnitude of the duelling problem. Zitner suggests that the acceptance of the duel as a manner of avenging one's honor, often for insignificant affronts, at the cost of one's life, made ultimate preoccupations immediate issues for those who accepted the code. The thesis is extremely suggestive in terms of *The Revenger's Tragedy.* The play could possibly involve a parody of the duelling code ritual imposed by Saviolo's manual as well as a satire of the dramatic tradition of which the play is a form. The article certainly suggests a social motivation for Tourneur's preoccupation.

16 Jan Kott, *Shakespeare Our Contemporary* (London, 1964), p.113.

'Historia Vom Rasenden Roland' - The First German Ariosto Translation

Gerhard Dünnhaupt

Encouraged by the success of his Tasso translation of 1626,[1] the German Baroque poet Diederich von dem Werder decided to turn his attention to the *Orlando furioso*. Since its first publication in 1516 this great epic had enjoyed an unparalleled success and numerous translations had carried Ariosto's fame to most civilized nations. Although no German version existed as yet, educated classes and court society were long familiar with the Italian original. During young Werder's stay at the court of Hesse-Kassel in 1596, for example, the reigning Landgrave Moritz celebrated the christening of his daughter with a vast tableau "in the style of Ariosto," and even in the poet's own native Anhalt one could encounter Ariostian characters like King Agramante at a masquerade held in 1614.[2] It was therefore just a matter of time before a German version of the epic would make its appearance.

Somewhat uncertain about the success of such a large publishing venture in the middle of the Thirty Years' War, Werder decided to limit the first instalment of his verse translation to a mere three cantos entitled *Drey Gesänge Vom Rasenden Rolandt*,[3] printed on a trial basis in 1632. In his foreword the German poet promises to continue his translation of the *Furioso* depending, of course, on public acceptance and favorable market conditions.[4] The anonymously printed first edition must have been well received, for several further instalments appeared in rapid succession in the course of the next four years.[5] A slightly altered reprint of the first three cantos was published in 1636 under the new collective title *Die Historia Vom Rasenden Roland*[6] and bound with the balance of the epic to complete the volume.

With its total of thirty cantos[7] the length of Werder's poem remains well below that of the *Orlando furioso*. Are we dealing with a mere fragment or a deliberately condensed version of Ariosto's famous epic? Since such a question cannot possibly be answered without prior critical examination of the text, it is our hope that the following pages may contribute to its ultimate solution. Whatever the result, *Die Historia Vom Rasenden Roland* must be counted among the *rarissima* of seventeenth-century poetry, for owing to the vicissitudes of the Thirty Years' War only a small number of copies have survived.[8] Though no further editions were published of this earliest German verse rendition, several other translations did appear in later centuries.[9]

In order to appreciate Werder's aims and poetical accomplishments fully, we must establish which parts of the *Furioso* he actually translated and – perhaps even more important – which parts he deliberately chose to omit.[10] While Ariosto's epic encompasses 4,842 stanzas or 38,736 hendecasyllabic verses, the *Roland* merely comprises 2,920 stanzas with 23,360 Alexandrines.[11] The attached chart conveys that Werder does not merely provide a stanza-by-stanza translation similar to his *Gottfried von Bulljon*[12] but that he undertakes a multitude of textual alterations in the process. Even though his *Historia Vom Rasenden Roland* is 358 stanzas shorter than the corresponding thirty-one cantos of the *Orlando furioso*, the translator almost never makes direct reference to his omissions. Only in a few rare instances does he provide his reasons for shortening Ariosto's text. At one occasion, for example, he remarks that a particular passage might have held little interest for his German readers, and in another case he concedes having intentionally

skipped a few spicy stanzas for reasons of propriety. A number of the more important textual changes shall be discussed below to determine Werder's motivation and to provide at the same time some measure of insight into his poetical translation techniques.

Throughout the first two cantos Werder follows the *Orlando furioso* with meticulous accuracy. His third canto, however, is marked by the deletion of no less than twenty-four stanzas,[13] for here he decides to reduce Ariosto's rather extensive genealogy of the Este family (A.III,29-55)[14] to a mere two stanzas (W.III,29-30).[15] Just below III,30 he interjects a laconically brief apology for having omitted this laudatory family tree of Ariosto's benefactors: "Hier mangeln etliche Gesetz an diesem Geschlechts-Register." A second Este genealogy (A.VII,61-63) is dropped in its entirety, not out of anti-courtly sentiments as has been suggested,[16] but obviously on the justified assumption that it is of no particular concern to his German audience. Werder also passes over Ariosto's lengthy catalogue of the nobles of England, Scotland, and Ireland (A.X,77-89) with the rather blunt explanation that it would have been "zu langweilig" for his readers. A similar matter-of-fact apology follows W.XIII,52: "Allhier mangeln wiederumb etliche Gesetze/ das künfftig Geschlechtregister der Damen/ so von Bradamante herkommen sollen/ betreffende." Here he is referring to the feminine counterpart of the aforementioned Este genealogy in which Ariosto enumerates Bradamante's offspring right down to his own duchess Lucrezia Borgia. Werder tries to avoid this laudatory passage by merging A.XIII,51-52 into one single stanza and removing the remaining nineteen stanzas altogether.

Agramante's massive demonstration of military might at the opening of canto XIV is so drastically reduced that just the first stanza of its two hundred verses survives in full. The next stanza of the *Roland* is a combination of A.XIV,2 and 10. The intervening seven as well as the nineteen following stanzas are missing completely. Instead, Werder's third stanza – Ariosto's nineteenth! – plunges directly *in medias res* by focusing on the only two personages of immediate consequence to the next scene: "Vmb Kürtze willen/ wil ich nur von zweyen Helden/ | Die sich gantz vngleich seyn/ von Sinn vnd Thun was melden" (W.XIV,3,1-2), implying that it would serve no purpose to copy yet another list of fictitious knights. Several further catalogues are removed in line with his general aim to maintain a continuous, uninterrupted flow of the main narrative recounting Orlando's adventures. Some references to Italian history and the contemporary political scene are likewise passed over by Werder, again no doubt on the assumption that they would be of little interest to a German audience. In one case (A.XXVI,31-53) he neglects to translate no less than twenty-three stanzas because they would have required his readers to be familiar with sixteenth-century Italian politics.

Ariosto's rather liberal attitude in erotic matters, on the other hand, does not seem to have caused nearly as many problems to the northern Calvinist as one might have anticipated. Just in a few isolated instances does he consider it appropriate to undertake deletions. In canto VII, for example, he reproduces merely the first half of a stanza. At this point the startled reader suddenly encounters a blank space in the poem, and only with the second half of the next stanza does Werder resume his narrative. The missing eight verses "Ma ne l'incontro il suo destrier trabocca ..." (A.VIII,49,5 to 50,4), which picture the hermit's amusing but vain attempts to force his attention on the sleeping Angelica, are discreetly omitted on account of their somewhat drastic Renaissance humour. The German poet also passes over the Petrarchistic description of Olimpia's physical beauty,

"ne la face de' begli occhi accende l'aurate strale ..." (A.XI,66), and when Ariosto begins to itemize her lovely feminine attributes one by one, "Vinceano di candor le nievi intatte ...", he tries to maintain some degree of propriety by combining the two stanzas A.XI,68-69 into a single one. Though Werder is no prude he must concede that substantial parts of Ariosto's lusty ménage-à-trois – "Pigliano la fanciulla, e piacer n' hanno or l'un or l'altro" – in A.XXVIII,51-71 have been "mit Fleiß ... vberhüpfft"[17] by him. Such differences between original and translation tend to reflect the changes that took place in the social climate since the erotically liberal days of the Renaissance owing to the restrictions imposed by both Reformation and Counter Reformation.

A Romance scholar may be somewhat taken aback by Werder's seemingly careless omission of a few of Ariosto's poetically most effective stanzas, but his sole interest lies in clarifying the narrative flow for his German readers. Thus he neglects to translate the pretty nature scene "Tra il fin d'ottobre e il capo di novembre ..." (A.IX,7), apparently because it would have disrupted the account of Orlando's adventures. Several other episodes that do not directly contribute to the "Historia" promised by Werder's title are likewise subject to deletion. Hence we miss the appearance of the cardinal virtues in the guise of four beautiful ladies, "la valorosa Andronica e la saggia Fronesia e l'onestissima Dicilla e Sofrosina casta" (A.X,52-54). The German text also fails to include the elaborate description of Logistilla's magic garden (A.X,61-63) as well as a number of mythological images that might have conflicted with Werder's endeavour to popularize the epic.

Aside from the relatively small number of omissions undertaken on moral grounds, the alterations are predominately of a structural nature as the foregoing paragraphs have shown. Only in one instance it appears that a cut was made for purely technical reasons: In the narration of Isabella's shipwreck we miss stanza A.XIII,16 – probably because Werder, never having been at sea, found himself unable to cope with Ariosto's rather complex nautical vocabulary. Our assumption seems to be confirmed by the absence of two further marine episodes (A.XIX,44-49, 51-53) which also contain a substantial number of nautical terms.

The German version of the twenty-third canto mystifies the reader by far exceeding Ariosto's original in length. Where did Werder get the additional stanzas? Not until 1894 was it discovered[18] that he interpolated here an entire episode from an earlier source, Matteo Maria Boiardo's *Orlando innamorato.* It should be emphasized that this is not a replacement of an unwanted passage but an additional scene which Werder must have considered necessary in order to familiarize his readers with earlier events. Although a continuous narrative, the episode is split up over six different cantos of the *Innamorato.* The German poet lifts these individual parts from the surrounding epic material and presents them as a single unit: further evidence of his efforts to streamline and simplify the complex narrative. As the *Orlando furioso* was conceived from the outset as a continuation of Boiardo's *Innamorato*, Werder encounters no technical difficulties when he merges the two epics, especially since his translation tends to gloss over the finer stylistic differences between the two Italian poets.

Let us take a moment to examine the translator's technique of incorporating the *Innamorato* episode into Ariosto's poem. Up to XXIII,95 the German version still follows the *Orlando furioso* stanza for stanza, this time even without abbreviations. At this point Werder injects a few verses of his own to justify his borrowing from Boiardo: "Verzeihet mir/

O Herr/ wann ich zurücke springe" (W.XXIII,96,1). With his address "O Herr" the translator seeks to assimilate his own style to that of Ariosto whose poem is dedicated to Cardinal Ippolito d'Este. The next two stanzas, also from Werder's own pen, establish the connection between Ariosto's and Boiardo's epics by means of a link passage. Now follow the interpolated seventy-six stanzas (W.XXIII,99-174) that stem from cantos X, XIV, XV, XVI, XVIII, and XIX of Book I of the *Orlando innamorato.*[19] They relate Roland's duel with Agricane which ends in the latter's christening and death – a series of events that helps to explain Mandricardo's burning desire for revenge. At the conclusion of this episode he again interjects a few verses of his own to restore the connection with Ariosto's epic: "Wer dis vnd anders mehr noch wissen wil/ der suche | Vnd forsch' es/ beym Turpin" (W.XXIII,175,1-2). Werder's false lead pointing to Turpino instead of Boiardo may account for the long delay in the discovery of his true source. Now he briefly recapitulates the events of the interrupted scene, and his very next verses correspond exactly to XXIII,96 of the *Orlando furioso.* The German poet thus succeeds in incorporating the entire Boiardo episode without losing a single verse of Ariosto's poetry.

At first glance, the twenty-fifth canto of the *Roland* also appears to exceed the corresponding one of Ariosto's epic by a considerable margin. As our chart clarifies, however, this is merely due to Werder's merging of cantos XXV and XXVI. His motivation for taking this step is not entirely clear. Most likely he felt that the cuts undertaken in XXVI were so substantial that the remainder could not be presented as a separate entity. Owing to this combination of two cantos the numbering of the *Roland* no longer corresponds to that of Ariosto from this point on.[20]

Although the *Historia Vom Rasenden Roland* comprises fewer stanzas than the *Orlando furioso,* our analysis shows that Werder was less interested in shortening the epic than in clarifying its narrative contents for the benefit of his German audience. Otherwise he would hardly have resorted to the introduction of an additional episode from a second source. The first thirty-one cantos of the *Orlando furioso*, Werder's main source, comprise 25,616 hendecasyllabic verses while the *Roland,* after deducting the 608 verses borrowed from Boiardo, consists of 22,752 Alexandrine verses. In other words, the German poet has reduced that part of the *Furioso* which he actually translated by no less than eleven per cent. The difference of 2,864 verses is substantial enough to permit us to draw several important conclusions regarding the translator's aims. The impact of Werder's omission of a few erotic passages, criticized by Wiesner,[21] appears to be exaggerated. As we have shown, only three such deletions actually took place. By far the greatest majority of the reductions, however, serves just one purpose: the achievement of a clear, uninterrupted flow of the narrative concerning the epic's real hero, Orlando. For this reason the translator reduces or omits many passages that might have been unclear or uninteresting to his readers, whether it be catalogues of fictitious names, praise of Ariosto's benefactors, or references to the contemporary Italian political scene. As an admirer and scholar of Italian literature, Werder is of course not unaware that a few of the omitted passages belong among Ariosto's finest poetic creations, but in his rôle as translator he must concern himself solely with the needs of his German readers. The didactic purpose, i.e. the overriding interest that the audience will properly understand and appreciate the matter presented to them, is always first and foremost on the minds of the early German Baroque translators. Even here, in a poem Werder claims to have written solely for the enjoyment and amusement of his readers,[22]

it cannot be altogether suppressed. The careful removal of every reference to Greek mythology and similar "learned" matter lends support to the assumption that he sought greater public acceptance by deliberately popularizing the epic. Indeed, after having dedicated his earlier Tasso translation exclusively to the nobility,[23] Werder suddenly seems eager to appeal to a wider audience. It would be erroneous, however, to interpret this honest striving for clarity, simplicity, and easier comprehension as a conscious move away from the aristocracy toward the lower classes, as has been surmised in the past.[24] All that may be discerned from Werder's popularization efforts is a deliberate emphasis on "delectare" rather than "prodesse" – in other words, a turn toward pure entertainment without specific didactical aims.

Notes

1 Cf. G. Dünnhaupt, "The Earliest German Verse Translation of Tasso's 'Gerusalemme liberata,'" *Renaissance and Reformation*, 9 (1973), 116-126.

2 Cf. R. Newald, *Die deutsche Literatur vom Späthumanismus zur Empfindsamkeit*, 6th ed., rev. (München, 1967), p.88; W. Wiesner, *Ariost im Lichte der deutschen Kritik* (Basel, 1941), p.6; J. C. Beckmann, *Historie Des Fürstenthums Anhalt*, V (Zerbst, 1710), 228; F. W. Barthold, *Geschichte der Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft* (Berlin, 1848), p.62-72.

3 [D. v. d. Werder], *Drey Gesänge Vom Rasenden Rolandt Aus dem Jtalianischen Poëten Ariosto zu Prob vnd Anfang vbergesetzt* (Leipzig, 1632), cont. cantos I-III.

4 Ibid., p.2.

5 *Fernerer Verlauff Der History Vom Rasenden Roland (1634)*, cont. cantos IV-X; *Noch weiterer Verlauff Der History Vom Rasenden Roland* (1634), cont. XI-XX; *Folge Der History vom Rasenden Roland* (1636), cont. cantos XXI-XXX.

6 [D. v. d. Werder], *Die Historia Vom Rasenden Roland ... von dem hochberühmbten Poeten Ludovico Ariosto ...* (Leipzig, 1636), cont. cantos I-III.

7 Werder's canto XXX corresponds to Ariosto's canto XXXI.

8 Locations of extant copies of the *Roland* editions are provided in the appendix to: D. v. d. Werder, *Gottfried von Bulljon*, ed. G. Dünnhaupt (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1974).

9 For a complete bibliography of all German translations of the *Orlando furioso* see G. Dünnhaupt, *Diederich von dem Werder: Versuch einer Neuwertung* (Bern: Lang, 1973), p.70-71.

10 Cf. ibid., p.49-69 for a canto-by-canto account of Werder's alterations as well as an examination of his language and style. G. Witkowski, *Diederich von dem Werder* (Leipzig, 1887), p. 88-90, lists most of Werder's cuts without dealing with their substance or trying to establish their raison d'être. Also cf. C. Fasola, "L'Ariosto tradotto da un secentista tedesco," *Rivista mensile di letterature tedesca*, 1 (1907), 71-85, and L. Vincenti, "La fortuna dell'Ariosto in Germania," *L'Italia che scrive*, 16 (1933), 251-253.

11 See note 11 on page 42.

12 Werder's Tasso translation bears the title *Gottfried von Bulljon oder Das Erlösete Jerusalem* (Frankfurt, 1626). Facsimile ed. cf. note 8 above.

13 Werder's inaccurate numbering to 77 is explained by the omission of stanzas 31 through 55.

14 The Italian text is cited after the following edition: Ludovico Ariosto, *Opere*, ed. G. Innamorati (Bologna, 1967).

15 Werder's German text is cited after the editions listed in notes 5 and 6 above.

16 Witkowski, p.84.

17 This statement follows stanza W.XXVII,53. Here Werder's numbering inexplicably jumps from 53 to 60 even though he actually deleted a far greater number of stanzas. Witkowski p. 90 states that Werder omitted A.XXVIII, 57-70 though in reality it was 51, 54, 57-64, and 66-71.

18 C. Fasola, "Diederichs von dem Werder Übersetzung des Ariost," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, 7 (1894), 202.

19 Fasola erroneously cites "Werder 98-176" and neglects to point out that Werder's source was Book I of the *Innamorato*. Ibid., p.203.

20 Out of a total of 234 stanzas of cantos XXV and XXVI of the *Furioso* Werder retains a mere

154 stanzas. His erroneous numbering to 163 may be explained by the absence of stanzas 61 to 69.

21 Wiesner, p. 7.

22 Werder, *Drey Gesänge,* p. 2.

23 Werder, *Gottfried,* title page [3].

24 Witkowski, p. 84.

11 The following chart illustrates how substantially the German poem differs from its Italian source:

Orlando furioso		*Rasender Roland*	
Canto	Number of Stanzas	Canto	Number of Stanzas
1	81	1	81
2	76	2	76
3	77	3	52
4	72	4	72
5	92	5	92
6	81	6	81
7	80	7	77
8	91	8	90
9	94	9	92
10	115	10	96
11	83	11	78
12	94	12	90
13	83	13	62
14	134	14	108
15	105	15	83
16	89	16	68
17	135	17	120
18	192	18	180
19	108	19	95
20	144	20	140
21	72	21	70
22	98	22	95
23	136 [!]	23	216 [!]
24	115	24	106
25	97 }	25	154
26	137 }		
27	140	26	118
28	102	27	81
29	74	28	66
30	95	29	87
31	110	30	94
32-46		Not translated	

Jonson's Tortoise and Avian

P. B. R. Doob and G. B. Shand

Studies of Jonson's use of beast fables in *Volpone* have elucidated the action of much of the play while throwing little light on the interactions of Politic Wouldbe and Peregrine, and especially on Politic's futile attempt to hide himself in the tortoise-shell.[1] Two recent articles have sought to clarify the play's tortoise symbolism, but have not located beast fable analogues for the event in question. The better of these articles, by Ian Donaldson, divides the tortoise symbolism into three categories: the representation of policy, used ironically here by Jonson; the representation of silence, with justice being done to the ridiculously garrulous Sir Pol; and the representation of the virtue of keeping at home, a quality of the chaste woman which can be seen as one of the central themes of the play.[2] Our aim is to supplement Donaldson's article with a strikingly appropriate beast fable analogue to the Peregrine-Politic plot and its tortoise-shell culmination.

The informing structure of this episode finds such an analogue in Avian's fable of the tortoise and the other birds, which we quote from *Caxton's Aesop:*[3]

> He that enhaunceth hym self more than he oughte to do To hym oughte not to come noo good / As hit appiereth by this present fable / Of a tortose / whiche said ... to the byrdes / yf ye lyft me vp wel hyghe fro the ground to the ayer I shalle shewe to yow grete plente of precious stones / And the Egle toke her and bare her so hyghe / that she myghte not see the erthe / And the Egle sayd to her shewe me now these precious stones that thow promysest to shewe to me / And by cause that the tortose myght not see in the erthe / and that the Egle knewe wel that he was deceyued / thrested his clowes in to the tortoses bely / and kylled hit / For he that wylle haue and gete worship and glorye may not haue hit without grete laboure / Therfore hit is better and more sure / to kepe hym lowely than to enhaunce hym self on hyghe / and after to deye shamefully and myserably / For men sayn comynly / who so mounteth hygher / than he shold / he falleth lower than he wold.

The general appropriateness of this fable to the discussions of foolish aspiration in the play is clear enough, but even more notable is its relevance to Politic's efforts to enhance himself more than he ought to do. Politic is determined to appear omniscient without any greater effort than that required to copy notes out of play-books, and when he takes it upon himself to instruct Peregrine in the proper manner of travel in Venice, his pearls of wisdom, hardly "grete plente of precious stones," are specious enough to warrant Peregrine's unmasking of the false knower, just as that other predatory bird, the eagle, unmasks the tortoise of the fable. And as the tortoise promised jewels, so Politic has promised great wealth:

> Well, if I could but find one man, one man
> To mine own heart, whom I durst trust, I would ...
> Make him rich, make him a fortune.[4]

Like the tortoise high above the earth, however, Politic has nothing to show, and Peregrine, recognizing this nothing, sets him up for the final humiliation, warning him of his immi-

nent danger, and asking him if he has no frail, no sugar chest or currant butt in which to hide himself.[5] Politic, in a choice of properties clearly signalling the connection between this episode and the beast fable, produces his tortoise-shell, clambers into it, and is unmasked as poseur and fool by the avenging Peregrine. The punishment is infinitely more gentle than that meted out in Avian, but then the context here is comedy, and Jonson is sporting more with follies than with crimes.[6]

The existence of this fable analogue in no way negates the symbolic functions of the tortoise discussed by Donaldson. It is reasonable to suggest, however, that the Avian fable, or something very like it, provides the informing structure for the Peregrine-Politic-tortoise episode, while Donaldson's happily appropriate symbolic values are the kind of literary bonus that would have delighted Jonson.

Glendon College, York University

Notes

1 See, for example, Jonas A. Barish, "The Double Plot in *Volpone*," *Modern Philology*, LI (1953), 83-92.

2 Ian Donaldson, "Jonson's Tortoise," *Review of English Studies*, n.s. XIX (1968), 162-166. See also Lloyd L. Mills, "Barish's 'The Double Plot' Supplemented: The Tortoise Symbolism," *The Serif*, IV (Sept. 1967), 25-28. This is a more limited treatment than Donaldson's.

3 *Caxton's Aesop*, edited by R. T. Lenaghan (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 178-179. Other versions of the fable are recorded in Ejner Jensen's "Theme and Imagery in *The Malcontent*," *Studies in English Literature*, X (Spring 1970), 367-384.

4 Ben Jonson, *Volpone*, edited by Alvin B. Kernan (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), IV. i. 42-44.

5 *Ibid.*, V. iv. 44-49. Compare Falstaff's exit in the buck basket (*Merry Wives of Windsor*, III. iv), and note Robert E. Knoll's case for the tortoise-shell as a version of the basket of Tudor farce, in *Ben Jonson's Plays: An Introduction* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), p. 100.

6 Avian's violence is threatened, however, as the Second Merchant cries, "Heart, I'll see him creep, or prick his guts" (V. iv. 70).

Érasme de Rotterdam, Liberté et Unité dans l'Église, ed. J.M. Bujanda. Quebec: Editions Cosmos, 1971. Pp. 223. $3.00 (paperbound)

The writings and personality of Erasmus of Rotterdam remain the *fontes* for most general speculation about the Reformation. They also offer immense pedagogical riches as an entry into the complex changes and unresolved dilemmas which surfaced in the sixteenth century. The present volume can be used in both of these ways. It is the product of the first interdisciplinary seminar of the Centre d'Etudes de la Renaissance de l'Universite de Sherbrooke, which brought together faculty and students of history, classical and modern, literature, philosophy and theology. Their joint efforts to make Erasmus relevant have led to their producing three admittedly modernized French versions of his Latin treatises: *On Prohibiting the Eating of Meat; Against the So-Called Evangelists; On the Peace of the Church.* This collection in turn obviously has as a major purpose the spreading of Erasmian ideas to a wider audience, especially to university undergraduates who still have much to gain from wrestling with the problems of the Reformation.

Erasmus can be used to illuminate every trend of the intellectual or religious history of the sixteenth century either by his positive contributions or by his negative reactions. He marks a culmination of late medieval personal piety, a major advance in Renaissance humanistic scholarship and educational practices, a basis (albeit mostly unintentional) of early modern skepticism, an important developer of the literary genre of satire, etc. His hostility to growing nationalistic biases in European religion, culture, and politics, and his international friendships both reflect problems which have continued to plague liberal intellectuals – as did his nagging personal inability to make a final choice and firm commitment in a situation whose logic seemed to demand one. The works included in this volume are somewhat more focussed than usual in their concern, since all date from the period after 1520 – after the lines were drawn.

The first treatise continued Erasmus' attempt to reform from within and to relax the church's legalistic impediments to a genuine Christian faith. Along with his similar pieces (*The Praise of Folly, On the Eating of Fish*), this work experienced the usual vituperative attacks reserved for critics in times of crisis. The final treatise is one of the most superb items in the catalogues of Christian humanism, European liberalism, and ecumenism. It has been translated often and requires little comment. But this ironic essay, however beautiful it may be, pales in the glare of the confrontation posed in the middle treatise.

The "so-called Evangelists" were those former disciples of Erasmus – Bucer, Capito, etc. – who were more radical than he was, but hardly members of the extremist sects. Erasmus' arguments ring very familiar to twentieth-century ears: betrayal of reform ideals by a younger generation who pushed on toward revolution; lack of tolerance and humility among the new breed; the unpleasantness both of revolutionaries themselves and of the society they had wrought and their failure to make immediate improvements in every area; their presumption has produced counter-revolution from Rome, thus harming the cause of Christian humanists everywhere; etc.

Erasmus and liberals fail to appreciate the power of "ultimate truth" in some people's

lives and the logical necessity to defend and advance that truth no matter what the costs. Revolutionaries fail to grasp the empirical logic of, and historical need for, skepticism, personally discovered solutions, and toleration. Such is the dialectic of European history since Erasmus. This book should force some professors and students to encounter their heritage.

GUY FITCH LYTLE, *The Catholic University of America*

Tudor Translations of the Colloquies of Erasmus (1536-1584), ed. Dickie A. Spurgeon. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1972. Pp. x, 366. $17.50

This is a difficult book to evaluate fairly. One point in its favour is that it makes available sixteenth-century English translations of nine of Erasmus' *Colloquies* (*The Pilgrimage of Pure Devotion; The Epicure; Polyphemus, or the Gospeller ... and Things and Names; A Merry Dialogue Declaringe the Properties of Shrowde Shrewes and Honest Wives; Inns; A Modest Mean to Marriage;* Of *the Yong Man* and *the Evill Disposed Woman; A Notable Storie ... of Two Alcumysts*). Anything which helps us move a step away from the microfilm reader and a step closer to the printed book is a blessing in itself. This is the book's one large contribution to Erasmian studies. Despite this the book is anomalous for a number of reasons. The costly business of facsimile reproduction has shot the price of this volume sky high, probably well beyond the scholar's financial means and certainly beyond the student's. Further, the book lacks important bibliographical detail which could well have replaced the skimpy and generally uninformative introduction. Are we to conclude that this work contains all Tudor translations of the *Colloquies* or only selected ones? The title does not make this very clear (despite the 1536 date) nor does the introduction. A glance at E. J. Devereux's *A Checklist of English Translations of Erasmus to 1700* (Oxford, 1968) shows that the editor of this collection has not made clear the differences between selected colloquies and single colloquies published in the sixteenth century and has failed to include (because of the arbitrary 1536 cut-off date) the very important and influential *Funus* colloquy (Devereux, C 19.1). In short, if facsimile reproduction of early English translations is supposed to add an aura of scholarship to a book, proper and precise bibliographical detail must also be supplied. Clearly, this volume cannot be meaningfully read without Devereux's *Checklist* close at hand.

It is difficult to decide on this volume's *raison d'être*. If it is meant for students why should it be a facsimile reproduction? If it is meant for scholars why does it contain no meaningful or detailed bibliographical material? Despite Mr. Spurgeon's statement that "the variants which exist between the copies reproduced here and other extant copies are minor," any editor worth the name would certainly want to check the reliability of such statements for himself.

One helpful item is the list of blurred readings throughout the text given at the beginning of the volume. Yet even these are somewhat incomplete; the last three lines of page 195, for instance, are in need of clarification and title-page borders are often so blurred that they are indecipherable.

Despite the increasing popularity of facsimile reprints, it seems that nothing short of the

original work itself, supplemented by microfilm reproduction, can satisfy the demands of the serious scholar.

DOUGLAS H. PARKER, *Laurentian University*

Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies, Volume 2. Ed. Lynn White, Jr. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1971. Pp. vi, 397. $12.00.

Volume 2 of *Viator* has a strong medieval bias: out of twenty-two articles, only three touch on the Renaissance. Henry Ansgar Kelly's "The Metamorphoses of the Eden Serpent during the Middle Ages and Renaissance" focuses on the lady-faced Eden serpent of medieval literature, drama, and art and does not brood over the gradual masculinization of this human-headed tempter in the sixteenth century. In "Mehmed II the Conqueror and his Presumed Knowledge of Greek and Latin," Christos G. Patrinelis uses contemporary Greek sources to prove that the Italian humanists who portrayed the fifteenth-century sultan as a philosopher-king fluent in Latin and Greek were wrong: he knew neither. Charles B. Schmitt writes on "Theophrastus in the Middle Ages," confirming that direct knowledge of Theophrastus' works was very limited indeed in the medieval period, and that it was not until the fifteenth century that some of his more important writings were discovered. All three articles have useful bibliographical footnotes. Yet if *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* is to live up to its name, succeeding volumes will have to give the later period fuller – and more adventurous – representation.

ROBERTA FRANK, *University of Toronto*

G. R. Elton. *Policy And Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell.* Cambridge University Press, 1972. Pp. xi, 445.

This book is the latest contribution to Dr. Elton's chronicling of the revolutionary doings of Thomas Cromwell. It is in fact a series of extremely detailed accounts of cases which illustrate the government's method of securing national obedience to Henry VIII's assumption of the headship of the church, an act involving unprecedented claims on the part of the government and consequently unprecedented problems in enforcement.

Dr. Elton challenges the widespread opinion that the Henrician Reformation was readily accepted by the people as a whole and tyrannically enforced where it was not so accepted. On the contrary, he contends there was widespread opposition, and the government's treatment of it was careful, often lenient, and strictly legal. Open defiance could be put down draconically, but a surprising amount of opposition was allowed to pass with mild rebukes. And Cromwell did not use spies; he did not need to. There were plenty of loyal subjects willing to denounce each other spontaneously. The author traces numberless cases from the first delation to the final disposition where that can be known, and records how gingerly the government had to deal with some cases. The result is a triumphant demonstration of his interpretation. Indeed, the only real fault in the book is the length – there are

too many stories. The book is simply too long. Surely a more modest length could have been achieved through selection, compression and a judicious use of appendices.

Length aside, the book reinforces Dr. Elton's (and others') sympathetic picture of Cromwell as a disinterested practitioner of limited liability revolution within the existing framework of English legality. The author's bias is evident but never obtrusive (nor are his characteristic deft cuts at historians who in one way or another fail to meet his exacting standards of interpretation or scholarly method). It is a mark of the Elton fairness that he never lionizes the new leviathan, never (well, hardly ever) glosses over its revolutionary nature. The reader's appetite is certainly whetted for Dr. Elton's promised study of the revolution as a whole, a study which should underline the extreme importance of these years as changing the course of English history, and history-writing.

This book vindicates the legality of the Cromwellian-Henrician revolution, and significantly this is taken as an exoneration. Cromwell would have rejoiced if he had known how much he would contribute to what has become one of the strongest convictions in the English mind – that what is done legally is done well, especially if done in the name of national unity. Cromwell's victims, great and small, were sacrificed to an awakening national self-sufficiency. Their crimes consisted of thinking and saying what had been thought and said from time immemorial. They did not change their minds fast enough. They will always be seen as standing in the way of the march of the English nation, fated to defeat and lucky to be defeated legally. Thomas Cromwell fell, but his cause triumphed. Dr. Elton has both analyzed and illustrated that triumph.

J. W. DALY, *McMaster University*

Derek Wilson. *A Tudor Tapestry: Men, Women and Society in Reformation England.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1972. Pp. viii, 287. $9.95.

This original and imaginative study of the period of the early English Reformation is a popular history in the best sense, in that its matter and style will invite and nourish the interest of the reader who is no specialist in the period, while its scholarship will not betray him. Mr. Wilson rests his work on the history of a group of English countrymen of the 16th century, especially of certain families with a Lincolnshire connection, and examines the way in which the great religious events of the reign of Henry VIII animated and interfered with their lives and fortunes. The strongest thread running through this "tapestry" is the fortune of the Ayscough family (also spelled Askew), in its own connections and in those of families with which it had important ties, especially the family of Ralph Lascelles of Sturton.

Mr. Wilson chose his sample well, since it provides him with a series of related vignettes or "panels" centring on particular individuals, of whom the most celebrated is Anne Ayscough, the dauntless and difficult heroine of some of Foxe's most memorable pages. As the story moves along we find ourselves presented with an interrupted but coherent narrative history of the main events of the Henrician reformation, concluding with the dramatic execution of Anne Ayscough in 1546.

The book is most original, and its authority most important, in the earlier chapters

dealing with the local history of these southern midlands families. It makes clear, as few discussions of the period do, how remarkable were the close links that joined seemingly disparate families, a lesson of English social history that cannot be too often taught. It is only when we appreciate how small the world of literate England was, and how concentrated it was socially and geographically, that we begin to understand the way in which ideas were transmitted and policies formed, and to see the toughness of the social fabric which was able to endure so many dramatic shocks without any very dramatic shifts in power or interest. At the same time Mr. Wilson's book is not without its problems. As his story moves away from the counties toward the court it retreats into the familiar pathways of Protestant historiography which have changed little since the days of Foxe. A modern reader may shrink from the style that can begin the climactic chapter, "While Anne [Ayscough] was nursing her aching limbs in the Tower ..." as he may find it difficult to admire the integrity of John Lascelles, the pious stool pigeon who betrayed the erratic past of Catherine Howard to her sanguinary spouse. At the same time Mr. Wilson's strong sympathies only occasionally lead him to neglect recent scholarly developments (as they do with Dr. John London, a hero to no party, whose rehabilitation by David Knowles is ignored here) and if some would like to hear more about *raison d'état* or economic factors, they must accept the fact that *A Tudor Tapestry* is simply not that kind of a book. Essentially it is a book about ordinary people who felt strongly and even passionately about the religious drama of their time. Mr. Wilson's well-documented and vigorous account has brought that passion to life again in a way that has not quite been thought of before, and his achievement deserves to be read widely.

JAMES K. McCONICA, *University of Toronto*

Gordon Rupp. *Patterns of Reformation.* London: Epworth Press, 1969. Pp. xxiii, 427. $11.50.

"Having begun with the English Reformation," Gordon Rupp "turned to Luther studies and after a space came face to face with the question, 'What do they know of Luther, who only Luther know?'" When we have finished these delightfully written studies on Oecolampadius, Karlstadt, Müntzer, Vadianus and Johannes Kessler, many of us will have to confess with their author "how luminous it has been to ponder the Reformation in the first decade of its origin, to see how very swiftly the patterns of Reformation open up, of which Luther's is the dominant but not the only one." Moreover, we *do* get to know Luther better – as a conservative reformer! – especially in the sections on Karlstadt and Müntzer, which constitute well over two-thirds of this impressive book.

Rupp sees Oecolampadius as "the reformer as scholar," who travelled the road from student to divine and from divine to reformer. The latter was a road of difficult and painful growth for this "introverted scholar" – by no means a great one – who possessed neither a forceful personality nor the gift of leadership. But when he was forced into a position of eminence at Basle, as Rupp sympathetically and movingly relates, Oecolampadius "rose manfully" – and effectively – to the challenge, becoming, among other things, a "cathedral preacher making the best of a bad voice, but taking fire beneath the burden of his message

... and moving the hearts of his great audience."

Karlstadt, on the other hand, "the reformer as Puritan," is depicted as a "muddler" who "did his damndest to hurt the cause" of Luther and the other Wittenbergers, a "biblicist" who was often a distiller of "exegetical moonshine," who found biblical warrant not only for smashing statues, but also for refusing to confer any more doctorates at Wittenberg because of the biblical injunction to "Call no man master." Had Luther's Protestantism prevailed over Karlstadt's Puritanism in the matter of images, Rupp notes, "later Protestantism, not least in the 19th century, would have been spared the cult of ... Uglification."

Thomas Müntzer is "the reformer as rebel," but the "least crackpot" of the apocalyptic Anabaptists. Nowhere in the volume is Rupp's keen theological judgment more operative than in this, at times repetitious, but always incisive section of monographic proportions. Rejecting facile Marxist interpretations of the complex religio-social movement that was the Reformation, Rupp has advanced the state of Müntzer scholarship to an extent that defies exposition in such a brief review as this.

HARRY McSORLEY, *University of Toronto*

M. L. Bush, *Renaissance, Reformation and the Outer World, 1450-1660.* New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1969 (1st ed. 1967). Pp. xii, 387. $2.95.

M. L. Bush's *Renaissance, Reformation and the Outer World, 1450-1660* is a competent but uninspiring textbook covering European history from the second half of the fifteenth century to the minority of Louis XIV. The political implications of the period are well worked out and investigated, and I have little criticism to voice on the subject. If people want a careful analysis of the political developments of the age, this is their book. Bush maintains that during the two centuries that he deals with, there was a tendency for monarchies which had enjoyed a tradition of political strength to get stronger, and that the main weapon of consolidation of royal power was the king's dispensation of government patronage to the traditional ruling order.

Yet, I find Bush's work unsatisfactory. The author has little inclination toward intellectual history and although today the winning ticket seems to be in the hands of the social historian, I still find it impossible to deal with this period of history, especially humanism, without a sophisticated analysis of the ideas and values of the age. Moreover, in the years which have followed the publication in 1967 of Bush's book, some interesting attempts to cover early modern Europe have been published, which make his work appear out of date since these other textbooks have been more sensitive toward contemporary trends in historiography. This is, for instance, the case with the eloquent social picture of Europe in John R. Hale's *Renaissance Europe 1480-1520* (1971), or with Eugene F. Rice's *The Foundations of Early Modern Europe, 1460-1559* (1970), or with H. G. Koenigsberger and G. L. Mosse's *Europe in the Sixteenth Century* (1968), or finally with A. G. Dickens' *The Age of Humanism and Reformation* (1972), which is an interesting attempt to combine new scholarship within an old frame of reference.

ANTONIO SANTOSUOSSO, *University of Western Ontario*

Wayne Shumaker. *The Occult Sciences in the Renaissance: A Study in Intellectual Patterns.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972. Pp. xxii, 284. $15.

When the occult sciences of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance are studied at all, they are most regularly examined either in order to solve specific literary problems or from a historical point of view that is more chronological than analytical. In this impressive and stimulating volume, however, Professor Shumaker has focussed on how people thought as well as on what they thought, with the result that his book is at once elucidative and evaluative; descriptive and analytical. As his sub-title informs us, the author is concerned with patterns of thought as well as the subjects thought about, but the patterns cannot be understood without thorough knowledge of the occult sciences themselves. Thus, for each of the five sciences discussed – astrology, witchcraft, white magic, alchemy, and Hermetica – the author provides us with ample citations of primary sources upon which he builds both a description of the science under consideration and an analysis of the intellectual patterns that made possible (or indeed inevitable) the beliefs examined. This derivation of analysis from specific source materials has been chosen by the author in order to steer a course between the Scylla of abstract philosophizing spun out of sheer mind and the Charybdis of simple antiquarianism.

The result of this approach is a volume that is useful for both the seeker of factual information and the historian of ideas. On the factual level Professor Shumaker provides us with a great deal of information about the five basic types of occultism, and each treatment, if less than encyclopedic, is much more than introductory. Even those scholars who are familiar with *occulta* in general and with one or two of its branches in particular will almost certainly find new and valuable information here about the rest. On the conceptual level Professor Shumaker makes three very significant contributions. First of all, he underscores the astonishing mass of occult literature – a corpus so neglected that its proper evaluation can "shock" an experienced Renaissance scholar:

> What most shocked me was the discovery of a learned, and evidently very serious, Latin literature on *occulta* which could not be interpreted as playful. By writing in Latin, the authors addressed an educated European audience; and their knowledge of ancient literature, if not consistently accurate, was often astonishingly wide. Moreover, they refer constantly to a Neo-Latin literature whose central importance to the intellectual life of the period is seldom realized. It was not by accident that of nearly six thousand books in the Bodleian Library in 1605 only thirty-six were in English ... In a word, my sense of the intellectual climate of the Renaissance has been lastingly affected by the findings ... The Renaissance was different from what I had thought, and its literature often had meanings of which I had been unaware. My own attitude toward the *occulta* was irrelevant to the fact of their currency" (pp. xvi-xvii).

Professor Shumaker's second observation is that this literature of the occult is not only extensive and serious, it is also concerned with content to the virtual exclusion of form. Regardless of modern scholarly commonplaces about the concern for style in the Latin literature studied in the Renaissance, the documents discussed in this book were read for what was believed to be factual information and for nothing else. Professor Shumaker's third and most significant contribution to our knowledge of how people thought in the

Renaissance is his delineation of the pervasiveness of analogical thinking in all of the sciences examined. As he sums it up, "Induction was not a discipline easily to be invented" (p. 31).

Professor Shumaker's volume has been very handsomely produced with some 58 illustrations, which, although not keyed into the text, are well-chosen and very instructive. It is written in his characteristically engaging style, and has a good index and a helpful note on the bibliographical complexities of this kind of research. All in all the book should enjoy a wide and appreciative reception.

CHAUNCEY WOOD, *McMaster University*

W. P. D. Wightman. *Science in a Renaissance Society.* New York: Humanities Press, Inc., 1972. Pp. 191. $7.50.

A. G. R. Smith. *Science and Society in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.* London: Thames and Hudson, 1972. Pp. 216. $8.95.

The history of science, as pursued by amateurs in earlier times, gave way in this century to the histories of various distinct sciences such as physics, biology, and geology. Specialists abandoned the over-enthusiastic approach to the achievements of a few great scientists and developed more objective accounts of stage-by-stage progress in each science at the hands of contributors of widely varying capabilities. A very large body of sober knowledge about the growth of different sciences, and about interrelations between their historical developments, has thus arisen, and this constitutes what is called internalist history of science.

The next appropriate study is that of the interworkings between science and society. This study results in what is called externalist history of science, which presently attracts the majority of students entering the field. But even when confined to relatively modern times, and to Western civilization in particular, the scope of this enterprise is too vast for immediate conquest. The most constructive approach at present appears to be to consider science and society during a limited period of time, or in a selected nation. The two books considered here deal only with the beginnings of modern science in Europe as related to society of the late Renaissance and of early modern times.

Professor Wightman has long been a specialist in the nascent sciences of the sixteenth century, a period that was relatively neglected until quite recently. Medieval science has been deeply studied since the pioneer work of Pierre Duhem around the turn of the century, while the seventeenth century had long attracted historians as the epoch of the Scientific Revolution, marked by the work of Galileo, Descartes, and Newton. The sixteenth century appeared to be a sort of interregnum, characterized by Duhem as one of widespread plagiarism rather than real scientific progress.

Nevertheless, science in the sixteenth century had a character of its own, neither medieval nor modern. It represented a turning away from medieval traditions to classical sources on the one hand, and to direct experience on the other. The latter trend first became evident in the 15th century; the former became conspicuous in the 16th century, soon after the appearance of printed books. Professor Wightman deals mainly with those two cen-

turies. His book ranges over the scientific aspects of voyages of discovery, political theory, medicine, chemistry, and astronomy, as well as touching on the effects on science of emerging nations and academies. Mystic elements as well as new applications of mathematics are brought in, and a concluding section on Francis Bacon and the stress on practical utility and collaboration toward progress sets the stage for the better-known attitudes of scientists in the seventeenth century.

Most of the principal names associated with the beginnings of modern European culture, whether scientists, architects, men of letters, political theorists, or dreamers receive some attention in this survey. In dealing with so broad a subject, Professor Wightman applies a number of interpretative opinions, arrived at after decades of study. These affect his presentation, not always happily; and in some areas he has relied heavily on secondary sources that are hardly up to the most recent studies. As a general presentation of a synthesis hardly attempted in any previous English book, however, the work fills a gap in our literature of the Renaissance.

Dr. Smith's book complements Professor Wightman's in ways that present a striking contrast. It is beautifully illustrated, in colour to a large extent. It outlines some of the medieval background, but deals mainly with the seventeenth century. A relatively small part is concerned directly with social aspects of science. The central section of the book concerns the main philosophical and scientific trends of the Scientific Revolution, and this material is necessarily treated very summarily. There is room for only half a dozen pages on Kepler and ten or a dozen each on Galileo and Newton, for example; hence only a few high points emerge from their works and hardly anything from those of their numerous and highly productive contemporaries. The print is quite large, and the illustrations are so numerous that the textual content is notably less than that of Professor Wightman's shorter and unillustrated treatment of the earlier period.

The account of seventeenth-century science given by Dr. Smith is generally representative of prevailing views among modern historians of science, so far as internalist development is concerned. Thus the work of Galileo is presented as a logical development from the writings of medieval authors, who are treated as Galileo's direct sources of inspiration; yet the author notes that another interpretation exists, and is not without its merits. In a book of this limited size it would hardly have been possible to present the material in more critical form. The book will serve as a very attractive introductory survey for those who are not specialists in the field.

STILLMAN DRAKE, *University of Toronto*

Arthur Efron. *Don Quixote and the Dulcineated World.* Austin and London: University of Texas Press, 1971. Pp. x, 203. $7.00.

On the opening page of this book, the author arrogantly states: "The present study ... offers a reinterpretation of *Don Quixote* that I believe is fundamentally incompatible with the conclusions of nearly all *Quixote* critics" (p. 3). It is this reviewer's sad obligation to admit that Mr. Efron's assertion is quite correct. The incompatibility is such that any judge would be very glad to grant divorce – in favour of *Don Quixote* criticism. Mr. Efron's attack

on Cervantine criticism in general is performed in a Procrustean fashion: all Quixotic criticism is divided into three arbitrary categories, labelled *idealist, cautionary* and *perspectivist* (pp. 4-10). Then he proceeds to define his neologism *Dulcineism*, which turns out to be "the belief that human life is satisfactorily conducted only if it is lived out in close accord with prescribed ideals of the received culture" (p. 11), which seems to me to be a most effective way of saying that *the Dulcineated world* is no more and no less than the Judaeo-Christian tradition. By the end of this first chapter Mr. Efron outlines his new approach: "In plan, this study will attempt to do that [i.e., "to minimize distortion by means of selective focus"], beginning with an examination of the main character, then proceeding to the secondary character and the nature of his relationship with Don Quixote. We shall go on finally to treat the expansion of the novel's implications within the other members of the Dulcineated world, which, in turn, will mean dealing at least occasionally with implications for our own world, Dulcineated as it also is" (p. 21).

Obviously, what we have in front of us is an interpretation of *Don Quixote* as if it were a message from the earnest campus radical. Its pages are full of the contemporary cant: for example, Master Peter's puppet stage presents "ethnic prejudice" (p. 119), because Gaiferos and Melisendra are pitted against the Moors. Or, in the first part of the novel, Don Fernando accepts to marry Luscinda because of "group pressure" (p. 128). Inevitably, mention of the speech on Arms and Learning in the first part of *Don Quixote* leads Mr. Efron to mention McGeorge Bundy, Vietnam and Santo Domingo (p. 111), and this, just as inevitably, will lead him to discuss the figure of "the super-patriotic Captive" (p. 130), i.e., the Captive Captain Ruy Pérez de Viedma. The radical bias is obvious, but it is not this that makes the book practically unreadable, but rather the style, which is incredibly bad for someone who is identified in the dustjacket of his book as an Associate Professor of English at Buffalo.

JUAN BAUTISTA AVALLE-ARCE, *The University of North Carolina*

Margaret Church. *Don Quixote: The Knight of La Mancha.* New York: New York Universith Press, 1971. Pp. xxxvi, 179. $7.95.

Professor Church has written a companion and study guide to *Don Quixote.* She identifies her intended readers as follows: "The companion is geared not for the publishing scholar in Spanish literature or the stylistic expert in the Spanish language but for the general reader and student of *Don Quixote* in translation" (p. vii). Her aim is to help such readers to understand Cervantes' complex masterpiece and to share her enthusiasm for it. To this end she offers her readers an overview of the novel, followed by chapter-by-chapter analyses of the material she considers "of particular thematic interest" (ibid.). There is much to recommend this book, including comments and comparisons (with Falstaff, King Lear, etc.) not so often found in the studies of professional Hispanists. On the other hand, the book reveals limitations likely to lead uninitiated readers of *Don Quixote* astray.

Professor Church calls on just over two dozen critics and scholars to support or amplify her own critical opinions. The list is small and, unfortunately, not as representative as it might be of the best of modern critical writing: Martín de Riquer, a worthy scholar but not a profound contributor to contemporary interpretations of *Don Quixote*, is by all odds

the scholar most often cited; Unamuno is presented as "the great critic" who epitomizes most Spanish criticism on *Don Quixote* (p. xiv); Américo Castro is nowhere even mentioned! Serious consequences flow from these bibliographical limitations. One example is the treatment of the picaresque in relation to Cervantes' work.

In her introduction Professor Church states: "Don Quixote is not a picaro, nor is Cervantes' novel picaresque in any definitive sense" (p. xv). On page 68 she characterizes the 1605 *Quixote* like this: "The book itself can be judged a highly amusing yet thoughtful picaresque tale." A little later she concludes that Book II "shows the book in the final analysis to be the purest example of the tragic genre and not, as Book I would have us believe ... the purest of picaresque comedies permeated with a pathos felt mainly, I suspect, by those who, like Cervantes himself, are prey to a thwarted idealism" (pp. 68-69). Some earlier remarks label Ginés de Pasamonte a conventional picaro and suggest that "he may represent the dark side of Cervantes" (p. 27). All this vacillation about how Cervantes' fiction stands in relation to the true picaresque genre suggests that Professor Church has not read the best Spanish discussions of the subject, which show the differences to be abysmal. She could have found orientation in Castro's well-known *El pensamiento de Cervantes* (Madrid, 1925, pp. 230-239) or in an excellent but uncited article in her own bibliography: Blanco Aguinaga's "Cervantes and the Picaresque Mode ..." in Lowry Nelson's *Cervantes* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969).

Space permits me to mention only two or three examples of one other kind of limitation, namely the tendency to make statements unsupported by the Cervantine text or even contradicted by it. We have already noted her speculation that Ginés de Pasamonte may represent the dark side of Cervantes. I can think of nothing in *Don Quixote* or in Cervantes' life to support such speculation. Among her comments on the adventure of the lions is the observation that "in previous episodes Don Quixote's luck was invariably bad" (p. 95). Not so; just three chapters earlier Cervantes made it clear that it was good luck that enabled Don Quixote to defeat the Knight of the Mirrors. As a matter of fact, both good and bad luck operate from time to time throughout both parts of the novel. In commenting on the adventure of the Parliament of Death, she expresses the opinion that Don Quixote's remark that "appearances are not always to be trusted" (p. 87) would be unthinkable from the Knight of 1605; yet it is the Don Quixote of 1605 who formulates the classic statement about the difficult problem of interpreting appearances: "So what seems to you to be a barber's basin appears to me to be Mambrino's helmet, and to another as something else" (*The Adventures of Don Quixote*, tr. J. M. Cohen, Baltimore, 1963, p. 204). A second edition of Professor Church's study would greatly benefit from closer adherence to Cervantes' text.

RICHARD L. PREDMORE, *Duke University*

Ruth Pike. *Aristocrats and Traders. Sevillian Society in the Sixteenth Century.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1972. Pp. xiii, 243. $10.50.

According to the author, the principal theme of the book is to challenge "two of the most frequent assumptions about Spanish history in the sixteenth century: the Spaniards' lack

of aptitude for trade and the total abandonment of commercial endeavors by ennobled merchants in favor of an aristocratic life based on land and rents" (viii). Together with the main title, this would seem to promise a discussion primarily concerned with trade and with the role of aristocracy, old and new, in the world of commerce in sixteenth-century Spain. While this intention, in effect, has been carried out, it accounts for only a portion of the subject matter; hence it does not accurately sum up the work as a whole. The historians' debate implied by the allusion to "frequent assumptions" remains outside the body of the discussion, and the author's "challenge," in fact, may be regarded as only one of several uses to which her discoveries may be put.

A clearer indication of the book's content is offered by the subtitle. Indeed, the nobleman shares his category of the "Elite" here with the clergy, lawyers, doctors, notaries and merchants. Taken together, they comprise about a half of the book. Most of the remaining discussion treats the working classes, the social outcasts and unassimilated classes: Moriscos, slaves and the underworld. In short, this is a comprehensive description of the social classes of Sevilla in the period of rapid change following the opening of the New World – a period, too, following upon the conclusion of the reconquest in the Peninsula, with its many difficult social problems continuing from the past. If the burgeoning commerce with America is one powerful source of change, another is the increasing social mobility of *conversos* and commoners.

To copious data drawn from archives in Sevilla, as well as from newly tapped sources in Madrid and London, has been added a substantial body of information from literary sources. This has not taken precedence over other kinds of evidence, but has served rather as a supplement where official documentation is scanty, as in the description of the Sevillian underworld. No serious criticism can be directed at the results of the process here, but such evidence is clearly of a different order. It would be injudicious to accept as reportage all of the naturalistic scenes of the picaresque genre. When they ring so true, however, as in the hands of Cervantes, who can know where to draw the line?

Since literary analogues are appealed to in speaking of the good-for-nothing sons of the elite (115), it might have been apposite to mention the most notorious Sevillian of them all: Don Juan Tenorio. All the more so in the light of claims that he was drawn from life. It could have been observed, too, that not only as a literary character, but as an historical personage, the scholarly and artistic career of the famous Juan Latino of Granada exemplified perfectly the eminence that a black freedman could attain in the sixteenth century in Spain. While the sampling from literature may be somewhat unsystematic, it is nevertheless entirely adequate for the purpose.

Not the least impressive feature of this competently prepared study – and one that inspires confidence – is the scrupulous respect accorded to the Spanish language.

EDWIN J. WEBBER, *Northwestern University*

Thomas E. Case, ed. *A Critical and Annotated Edition of Lope de Vega's "Las almenas de Toro."* Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures, Number 104. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1971. Pp. 217. $6.50.

Las almenas de Toro exists as a manuscript in the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid, in two different hands, with a title page added in yet another hand, presumably some time later. As Professor Case hastens to point out, "The manuscript is not a Lope autograph." (p. 12). Seventeenth-century printings (in *Partes*) are extant, and Case has attempted a derivation of the various texts from the apparently lost autograph. The play has been printed several times also in the present century, attesting to a certain popularity which it has enjoyed. From its versification the date assigned to *Las almenas de Toro* by Morley and Bruerton was 1610-19 (probably 1610-13). From other data Case concludes in his edition that Lope de Vega wrote the *comedia* between 1615 and 1619.

In addition to describing the manuscript, commenting on printed versions, and attempting to date the play, in his well written Introduction Professor Case gives us a great deal of additional useful information, such as an analysis of plot and versification, the historical setting, the sources for the plot, the characters (Princess Elvira, King Sancho, the Cid, Vellido Dolfos, etc.), the style, *Las almenas* as a tragicomedy, and a brief evaluation. The critical text is carefully presented, with variants in footnotes. The Notes to the Text of the play are abundant and accurate. The "Bibliography of Works Consulted" is rich and to the point. (It is interesting to note that Dr. Case acknowledges the guidance of Professor Edmund de Chasca, whose fruitful work on the *Cid* and on the *Comedia* is very well known.)

It would have been helpful if Case had included an index to words and phrases commented on in the Notes – for the reader's convenience – and perhaps an index to critics cited in the Introduction, again to facilitate ready reference. Nevertheless, the edition has been carried through to a successful conclusson, and it incorporates all the various necessary characteristics of a "critical and annotated edition." The editor and critic is to be congratulated on his achievement in bringing to us in scholarly form yet another important portion of the Lope de Vega canon.

J. H. PARKER, *University of Toronto*

Fred M. Clark. *Objective Methods for Testing Authenticity and the Study of Ten Doubtful "Comedias" Attributed to Lope de Vega.* Studies in the Romance Languages and Literatures, Number 106. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1971. Pp. 185. $5.00.

Professor Clark has analysed very carefully ten *comedias* at times attributed to Lope de Vega. The plays are: *Alejandro el segundo, Los contrarios de amor, El prodigioso príncipe transilvano, Santo Angelo, El rey fingido y amores de Sancha, El rey por trueque, El toledano vengado, El valiente Juan de Heredia, La venganza piadosa* and *Bernardo del Carpio.* The "objective methods for testing" presented and employed are those put forth by various critics over a period of some years, such as Morley's article (*HR*, 1937), the Morley and Bruerton *Chronology* (1940), Poesse's *Internal Line-Structure* (1949), Fichter's article (*Homenaje a Archer M. Huntington*, 1952), and that of Arjona (*HR*, 1956), etc. To sum up his procedure, Clark writes (p. 30): "The present work is a study of the orthoepy and rhyme patterns of ten plays attributed to Lope but classified as doubtful by Morley and Bruerton on the basis of versification. Other studies of these plays which have employed

objective criteria will be utilized." Whenever possible, manuscript copies and early printed forms of the plays are referred to.

Dr. Clark further explains his purpose (p. 30): "to accumulate all the possible non-Lopean elements in the *comedias* in order to determine whether they provide sufficient evidence to warrant rejection of these plays as being by Lope and thus contribute in a small way to the establishment of a canon of Lope's *comedias.*"

After the detailed scrutiny of each play in the manner described, there is a good summing up, and "Conclusions" reached (and I would say proven) are that "The accumulation of non-Lopean elements revealed in the study of these ten *comedias* provide sufficient evidence for rejecting the plays from a canon of the dramatist's authentic works." (p. 177) The "résumé of the most noticeable non-Lopean elements in the plays studied" (pp. 178-81) presents in a very concise manner the kernel of the arguments, sufficient to show that the plays are not Lope de Vega's, or, at best, in a few cases, "radically recast" by some other hand or hands.

A reviewer can only congratulate Professor Clark on a job well done. Clear and logical, the arguments are brought forth systematically for the drawing of correct solutions. The bibliography is scholarly and to the point (why not the Morley and Bruerton *Cronología* of 1968?). A helpful addition to the volume would have been an index of critics cited. But that is only a minor point. Let us hope that Dr. Clark will continue to apply his "objective methods for testing authenticity" to the large number of other plays of doubtful Lopean attribution.

J. H. PARKER, *University of Toronto*

Augusta Espantoso Foley. *Occult Arts and Doctrine in the Theater of Juan Ruiz de Alarcón.* Genève: Librarie Droz, 1972. Pp. iv, 108.

In this neatly presented and printed book, the author provides an interesting study of a fascinating topic that certainly merits attention. The plays that form the object of this study include *La cueva de Salamanca, Quien mal anda en mal acaba, La manganilla de Melilla, La prueba de las promesas, El dueño de las estrellas,* and *El anticristo.* A general survey, with special reference to Spanish literature, introduces the reader to the occult and its different facets (necromancy, pacts with the devil, divination, omens, etc.) as found in Western literary traditions. Opinions, definitions and views of theologians and philosophers of different periods are also provided as a background, and the prevalent theological attitudes in the Golden Age are discussed with considerable detail. Alarcón's literary use of the occult is thus presented in a historical and social context, which considerably contributes to an over-all understanding of the subject. The book is carefully documented and furnished with a very useful bibliography.

In the course of the study two main conclusions seem to be drawn:

1) No didactic intention is implied by Alarcón's use of the occult and the inclusion of doctrine in Alarcón's plays constitutes merely a necessary safeguard against any possible accusations of unorthodoxy with its potentially dangerous implications. When doctrinal statements concerning magic are made, these are cleverly fused with the plot.

2) Alarcón employs the occult as a literary tool, useful for its dramatic possibilities, for the advancement of the plot and for the solution of insoluble situations, presumably as a *deus ex machina.*

These are basically valid statements if accepted with some minor reservations. Since Golden Age theatre is geared to a wide audience and thus the entertainment aspect is predominant, one would not expect explicit didacticism. Doubtless the necessity to protest one's faithful adherence to official church doctrine is bound to pose an artistic problem and in a less skilful writer than Alarcón it could easily lead to intrusive didacticism. While this is avoided in Alarcón, he and other Golden Age playwrights nevertheless do present a consistent vision of the world. Since this is presumably shared by the audience, we cannot speak of overt didactic intent, yet the plays do, in some cases at least, contain a definite moral statement. Thus, in view of Golden Age attitudes to diabolical pacts, the central theme of *Quien mal anda en mal acaba* boils down to that of "crime does not pay," while *El dueño de las estrellas* extols the superiority of reason and free will over sidereal influences. In both cases Alarcón takes sides with issues relevant to his contemporaries and in this sense a didactic statement is implicit.

For the above and other reasons I feel that the use of the occult as a mere literary *tool* appears to be slightly overemphasized in the author's conclusions. A playwright can obviously draw on countless devices to advance his plot, but the choice of a particular solution may be intricately interwoven with other intentions. One certainly has to agree that *La prueba de las promesas* "presents the subtlest use of magic," but is magic really *indispensable to the development of the story?* Without it the play's atmosphere would become different indeed, but I can see no reason why the test of the two suitors could not be developed on a realistic plane. As to the use of magic as a tool to solve an intricate situation, it certainly applies in the case of *La manganilla de Melilla,* but, depending on one's viewpoint, in *Quien mal anda en mal acaba* we seem to have an insoluble situation created by magic, which is solved by a most prosaic *tool,* the out-of-the-blue appearance of the *familiares* of the Inquisition at the point of no return. Given the nature and origin of the "villain," the choice of magic and the pact with the devil seem to be somewhat more than a mere device. The play, which smacks of anti-*morisco* bias, chooses an anti-hero who is a *morisco,* previously convicted by the Inquisition for secretly practising the Islamic faith, and whose grandfather was likewise on good terms with the devil. The connection of the *moriscos* with superstitions and the occult is notorious and not entirely unjustified as borne out by numerous *aljamiada* treatises on magic. On the other hand, the image of Islam among Christian theologians as an *abominable secta de Mahoma,* supposedly inspired by the devil, was all too prevalent. Here we have, therefore, a rather stereotyped portrayal of the *morisco* as conceived by Alarcón's contemporaries: untrustworthy in his newly acquired faith and given to magic practices and superstitions. The occult would therefore seem to have more than a functional significance in the story of Román Ramirez; it also characterizes Román and it is an integral part of the content. Apart from the story of individual conflicts, we also sense something of the irreconcilable antagonism between Christianity and Islam under the surface.

Another point of view which I cannot entirely share is a remark on p. 51, concerning astrology, where some lines are cited from *El dueño de las estrellas* as "another proof of Alarcón's complete disbelief in the occult." This is doubtless a complex problem, but

condemnation of the occult does not imply *complete* disbelief. In the hierarchy of values, implicit in Alarcón's vision of the world, free will and reason, being God's special gift to man, occupy a predominant place, while astrology is relegated to a subservient, if not subversive, role. This does not, however, invalidate the potential effectiveness of the occult and I see no complete negation in the passage quoted nor in most of the theological opinions cited.

The possibility of conflict in the play is precisely based on two almost equally strong antagonistic forces. In this conflict free will triumphs, but it should be noted that sidereal influences, as in Calderón's *La vida es sueño*, are narrowly averted at the end by a supreme effort of will on the part of the protagonist. If – at least from within the artistic vision of the play – the influences of the stars were regarded as completely ineffective and non-existent, there would be no conflict and no tragedy.

Notwithstanding these debatable points, the book makes stimulating reading and underscores the significance of the occult in the Golden Age literary vision in general and in particular in Alarcón.

O. HEGYI, *University of Toronto*

Jack H. Parker and Arthur M. Fox, general editors. *Calderón de la Barca Studies, 1951-69. A Critical Survey and Annotated Bibliography.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971. Pp. xiii, 247. $12.50.

Early in the 1950s members of the Comediantes, an informal, international group of persons interested in the Spanish *comedia,* began discussing the need for up-dated bibliographies of Lope de Vega, Calderón, and other major dramatists of the Golden Age. A call for volunteers was answered by several scholars whose efforts led to the publication in 1964 of *Lope de Vega Studies, 1937-1962. A Critical Survey and Annotated Bibliography,* published as a project of the Research Committee of Spanish Group Three of the Modern Language Association of America. Encouraged by the response to the Lope de Vega bibliography and by the demonstrated feasibility of their cooperative scholarship, the Research Committee soon began to make plans for a similar volume devoted to Calderón. However, since Warren T. McCready's invaluable *Bibliografía temática de estudios sobre el teatro español antiguo* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966) covers bibliographical material (editions and studies) published between 1850 and 1950 on the Spanish *comedia* and dramatists, including Calderón, it was decided to limit the Calderón volume to the years 1951-1969.

As was the case in the preparation of the Lope de Vega volume, compilers assumed the responsibility of assembling all the bibliographical data for a given one- or two-year period and of writing for inclusion in the Critical Survey a résumé of the scholarly activity corresponding to their assigned years. The fourteen compilers, representing various Canadian, American, and Mexican universities, include the following: J. C. Castañeda, A. M. Fox, D. L. Bastianutti, H. W. Hilborn, Carlos Ortigoza, K.-L. Selig, J. H. Parker, Margaret Falconer, Walter Poesse, R. W. Tyler, F. J. Hernández, R. L. Fiore, Richard Hildebrandt, and J. G. Renart.

Similar in plan and composition to the Lope de Vega volume, the present work includes (as indicated by the title) a critical survey of scholarship, an annotated bibliography covering general editions of Calderón's plays and editions of individual works, and an annotated bibliography of general studies devoted to Calderón and of critical studies devoted to individual plays. A notable improvement of the Calderón volume over the *Lope de Vega Studies* is the inclusion of an index of editors and authors represented in the work (but book reviewers are omitted in the index).

As might well be expected in a work of collaborative enterprise (especially one in which the editors and compilers have never been able to meet as a group), there is some discrepancy – although commendably minimal – in the treatment of the material and the amount of space devoted to it. In the Critical Survey, for example, a few compilers have noted the exact number of entries corresponding to their assigned years; other compilers have not done so. One two-year period is represented by four pages of commentary; another receives less than half a page. The reader is at a loss to know whether the second period was simply less productive than the other or whether the second compiler was less loquacious than his colleague.

But these are trifling matters and they do not subtract substantially from the overall value of the book. Of greater importance is the fact that by and large the compilers, in both the Critical Survey and the Annotated Bibliographies, have distinguished between the major contributions to Calderonian scholarship and minor ones. And surely all students of the *comedia* should be heartened by the quantity and quality of the scholarship devoted to Calderón by leading Hispanists in several countries. One cannot fail to be impressed by the rich contributions of Calderonistas of English or Scottish origin (Edward Wilson, Alexander Parker, Bruce Wardropper, Albert Sloman, Peter Dunn, C. A. Jones, and others); nor can one fail to rejoice over the resurgence of the German school of Calderonian scholars under the leadership of Hans Flasche. It is also good to note to what extent Angel Valbuena Briones is carrying on the labours of his father, Don Angel Valbuena Prat, Dean of Calderonian scholars. And it is to be hoped that in the United States more young Hispanists will follow Everett Hesse in his dedication to Calderonian studies.

Indeed, the period 1951-69 has been a fruitful one with regard to Calderonian scholarship, but notwithstanding the many aspects of Calderón's theatre that have been so expertly explored – especially the *autos sacramentales* – one fact emerges clearly from a perusal of *Calderón de la Barca Studies:* we still need an up-to-date, definitive book on Calderón, one that comprehends and synthesizes the vast amount of material now available on him and his dramatic art. Several of the Calderonistas mentioned above are admirably qualified to write such a book – or it could be that there are younger Hispanists who are competent to undertake that important task. The tricentennial year of Calderón's death – 1981 – is not far off, but there is still time for some gifted scholar to commemorate his passing with the book that he deserves. Thanks to the editors and compilers of the present volume the task will be made easier.

RAYMOND R. MacCURDY, *The University of New Mexico*

Albert Douglas Menut, ed. *Maistre Nicole Oresme: Le Livre de Politiques d'Aristotle.* Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1970. Pp. 392. $10.

Nicole Oresme has been restored in recent years to a deservedly prominent position in the history of ideas, and this in no small measure due to the dedicated efforts and skill of Professor Menut. His editions of Oresme's French translations of Aristotle are now complete, including the *Livre de Ethiques* (1940), the *Livre du ciel et du monde* (1941-1943), the pseudo-Aristotelian *Livre de Yconomique* (1957) and now finally the *Livre de Politiques.* It is Menut's publication of the *Livre du ciel ...* which seems to have stimulated in recent years an intensive re-examination of Oresme's contribution to the history of medieval science, to the point where he is now generally acclaimed as the foremost natural philosopher of the fourteenth century.

However, Nicole Oresme was more than just a distinguished and original scientific mind: a number of his writings are concerned with wider behavioral issues, the rational and orderly conduct of life in society. These humanistic preoccupations are particularly well exposed in the commentary to his translation of the *Politica.* It may well be that this long-awaited edition will stimulate new research into the stature of Oresme the humanist, who seems to be every bit as interesting as Oresme the scientist.

There is a third aspect to Oresme's greatness which is not so well served by Menut's edition. The editor was, of course, primarily concerned with Oresme's thought; but Oresme was also a highly creative user of the French language, to the extent that he has left a rich heritage of over 400 common words in the lexicon of modern French, an achievement rivalled only by those of Rabelais and Victor Hugo. For the lexicologist, however, Menut's text is not entirely adequate. The critical apparatus is severely reduced, not only for understandable reasons of economy – "the expensive waste of printer's ink" – but also, regrettably, to avoid "clutter" and "an extended exercise in futility." In order to explore the full contribution of Oresme to the history of the French language, all manuscripts and early printed editions would have to be re-examined in detail. Practical considerations seem to have dictated against an English translation of the text, a most useful feature of the other three editions given to us by Menut. It is unfortunate that even more of the immense amount of detailed information and understanding accumulated by the editor in his years of painstaking work could not have been made available to future researchers.

The edition, like the others in the series, is beautifully presented, with helpful introductory sections on the intellectual background of the period, the life and work of Oresme, and the sources of his extensive commentary. A word of gratitude and congratulation is certainly due to Professor Menut on the completion of this series of editions which restore to us more completely one of the most remarkable and influential men of the Scholastic age.

ROBERT TAYLOR, *University of Toronto*

Forrest G. Robinson. *The Shape of Things Known: Sidney's Apology in its Philosophical Tradition.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

The purpose of this book is a re-interpretation of Sir Philip Sidney's definition of poetry as a "speaking picture" in terms of what the author calls "visual epistemology," or the philosophical tradition of conceiving of thinking as seeing. Thus the "notable images" praised in the *Apology* are not concrete visualizations, but moral concepts, Ideas, which ever since Plato have been described in terms of a visual analogy. The first two chapters therefore provide a valuable and at times dazzling synopsis of the main epistemological traditions, firstly from the pre-Socratics through the Middle Ages to the Florentine Neo-Platonists, and secondly in the Renaissance, emphasizing the boost given to visual methods of perception by printing, mathematics, emblem literature, contemporary art theory and the diagrammatic methods of Peter Ramus. The second half of the book analyses the theory of Sidney's *Apology* and the practice of the *Arcadia* and *Astrophil and Stella,* in order to demonstrate the connection between them.

Few to-day would quarrel with Robinson's thesis, especially since Geoffrey Shepherd's edition (1965) of the *Apology,* with its introductory survey of the philosophical tradition, or of Walter Davis' *Idea and Act in Elizabethan Fiction* (Princeton, 1969), a work which Robinson does not mention. Like many books with a thesis, however, *The Shape of Things Known* suffers from over-emphasis. The two chapters on the epistemological tradition bring out clearly the main divergence between those who derived *imagines* from illumination, as in Neo-Platonic and Augustinian thought, and those who, in some version of Aristotelian psychology, derived them by abstraction from sense data, only to submerge these irreconcilable views in the single term "visual epistemology," and despite the fact that Sidney himself firmly rejects the empirical approach. Similarly, Robinson ignores the substantial difference between various types of visualized conceptions; the "striking" images of the mnemotechnic tradition derived from Cicero's *De Inventione* and the *Ad Herennium,* the highly abstract tables and charts of Ramist method, and the allegorical, mystical and emblematical pictures of the Lullian-Brunonian systems not only have nothing in common except the joint analogy with sight, but actually, as Francis Yates showed in *The Art of Memory,* produced battles of the books, in one of which Sidney may have tried to act as mediator.

Sidney's undoubtedly visual approach to concepts is also stretched to make him indifferent to the audible elements of literature, despite the fact that "a speaking picture" is wisely double-edged. Even Walter J. Ong, from whom Robinson's emphasis on visualized conception is largely derived, warns in *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* that though invention is etymologically visual, judgement, requiring process, is not, and that therefore "any attempt to deal somewhat fully with the intellectual processes must rely on analogies between understanding and hearing as well as between understanding and seeing." Robinson is so concerned to demote hearing that he actually misreads Sidney's statement about the role of verse in aiding memorization. The statement that every word has its "natural seat, which seat must needs make the words remembered," concerns the benefits for memory of rhyme and rhythm and *not* the "word's place (in the logical sense) on the graphic fore-conceit underlying the poem" (p.120). But when he comes to the analysis of Sidney's works, Robinson in fact provides some very perceptive accounts of how the sound texture, especially of the Arcadian dialogues, is essential for our understanding.

Perhaps the least attractive aspect of an otherwise uncontentious book is the continuing quarrel with Neil Rudenstine (*Sidney's Poetic Development,* 1967), over the interpretation

of *energia*, which Rudenstine reads as a dramatic energy of style, transmitted especially by direct address, personification, prosopopeia and other animating techniques. Robinson insists that it must instead mean "conceptual clarity," but finds himself illustrating again and again, especially in *Astrophil and Stella*, the very dramatic devices he would demote as irrelevant. One is forced to conclude that Sidney meant what he said when he defined *energia* as "forcibleness," and regretted its absence in the love sonnets of his contemporaries.

Despite these objections, or indeed because of them, the book is well worth the effort of careful reading, providing the intellectual stimulus of necessary wariness which safer studies deny one, and constantly cancelling out one's uneasiness over details by summaries and conclusions as wisely latitudinarian as Sidney's own.

ANNABEL PATTERSON, *York University*

Gerald Eades Bentley. *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971. Pp. ix, 329. $10.

In an earlier book entitled *Shakespeare and His Theatre*, G. E. Bentley speculated that we might achieve more schematic understanding of Renaissance dramatic practices by distinguishing among "amateur," "occasional," and "fully professional" playwrights.[1] His present work arrives at these divisions. Of two-hundred fifty authors who wrote plays during the Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline periods, Professor Bentley distinguishes twenty-two playwrights who served the commercial theatre primarily, and from this group isolates a smaller number of "attached" or "professional" dramatists: Heywood, Fletcher, Dekker, Massinger, Shakespeare, Shirley, William Rowley, and Brome. *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time* uses the known practices of these playwrights to standardize the professional theatrical attitudes and activities of writers for the London stage: attached professionals, it argues, commonly assume that the writing, editing, revising, and publishing of their work must frequently be a company, and thus a communal, responsibility; they see their plays as theatrical, not literary, efforts; their work shows special regard for the requirements of theatrical performance.

By "professional dramatist," Professor Bentley means specifically those men who had continuous association with one London theatre or another, who showed hesitation about seeing their plays through the printing process, and whose play production was consistent and regular. Most important, the professionals were "primarily dependent upon the theatres for their livelihood."[2] Income from other than theatrical sources or eclectic compositional habits exclude from the professional category many of the most influential Renaissance dramatists: Jonson, Marston, Webster, Chapman, and Ford.

Professor Bentley's categories are less arbitrary in practice than they appear in summary. And they are documented with exhaustive conscientiousness. That the acting companies imposed publishing restrictions on their attached playwrights is evidenced by the 1635 and 1638 contracts drawn up between Richard Brome and the players of the Salisbury Court theatre; similar restrictions are implied by the publishing records of other attached professionals. The negative attitudes of amateur playwrights toward their professional contemporaries illustrate the low social status of attached dramatists. On the other hand, pay-

ment records from Henslowe's diary indicate the economic rewards of writing for the commercial theatres. The sequence of Henslowe's payments for specific plays further suggests general compositional habits and collaborative practices, at least for writers attached to his companies,[3] during the years 1597-1602.

Unfortunately for those of us with literary bias, Professor Bentley's interests rarely lead him to derive evidence from the internal idiosyncracies of literary or dramatic texts. The book's documentation comes almost exclusively from contemporary accounts of theatrical affairs, most of which are familiar and available elsewhere.[4]

We know that prolonged association with the public stage frequently created a marked disparity between an Elizabethan playwright's economic and his social status. Shakespeare's sonnet 111 focuses on the emotional burdens attending such a separation of fundamental value structures:

> O, for my sake do you with Fortune chide,
> The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
> That did not better for my life provide,
> Than public means which public manners breeds.
> Thence comes it that my name receives a brand,
> And almost thence my nature is subdued
> To what it works in, like the dyer's hand.

This sonnet is the more extraordinary if we recall that it was composed when the author had long been an actor, playwright, and shareholder in the most economically successful theatrical enterprise of Renaissance England.

Rather than being affirmed by the popular success of his art, Shakespeare almost finds himself subsumed *in* it, and is disturbed by the absence of clear boundaries to distinguish his personal and private from his professional and public roles. Here he laments the necessity of diffusing his personal experience into public statement, and further implies that economic reward is scarcely worth the anxiety created by what he takes to be public notoriety and psychological exposure.

Shakespeare's assumption that attachment to the professional theatres was somehow demeaning is not unique. Professor Bentley demonstrates that amateur Renaissance playwrights habitually dissociated their works from those prepared for commercial performance; often their disclaimers reflect strong cultural prejudice against the public stage. Shakespeare's sonnet thus sustains scholarly conclusions about the status of attached playwrights. It also invites us to expand our understanding of what we consider to be "significant" aspects of "the normal working environment circumscribing the activities" of the professional dramatist.[5]

STEPHEN LACEY, *University of California, Santa Barbara*

Notes

1 G. E. Bentley, *Shakespeare and His Theatre* (University of Nebraska Press, 1964), p.23.

2 G. E. Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time* (Princeton University Press, 1971), p.30.

3 Bentley is weaker when he extends these conclusions to companies for whom no such records exist: in the case of writers for the King's Men, he is tangential on the problems surrounding the Beaumont,

Fletcher, and Massinger collaborations, and unnecessarily vague about both Shirley and Shakespeare.

4 The book is particularly indebted to J. Q. Adams, ed., *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*; R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert, eds., *Henslowe's Diary*; Ann Haaker, "The Plague, the Theatre, and the Poet," *Renaissance Drama* n. s. I (1968), 283-306.

5 Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time*, p. vii.

Frederick Hartt. *History of Italian Renaissance Art.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J. and Harry N. Abrams, N.Y., 1969. Pp. x, 636.

This is a monumental work of scholarship by one of the greatest of the modern American historians of Italian art. It is, in the author's intention, addressed primarily to the students attending his art-history course at the University of Virginia. These students should (and I am sure they do) consider themselves fortunate to have such a mentor, a mentor who pays them the compliment of assuming that they are fully capable of the effort required to assimilate the occasionally difficult technical language of the arts. To an intimate grasp of the enormous materials of his specialty (a grasp which is the result of the "*autoptic*" inspection of each one of the art-works examined), Professor Hartt unites a complete knowledge of their backgrounds (political, religious, social, economic).

Professor Hartt excels in discriminating the strands of complex historical situations and in describing in concise but substantial outlines the peculiar originality of the various artists. Aesthetic enthusiasm predominates, but a sober, constantly well-balanced judgment controls that enthusiasm in matters stylistic and in the appraisal of the interrelationships prevalent between artists and between trends of artistic creation.

Professor Hartt feels – and there is, I think, thorough justification for this feeling – that in a period like the Renaissance, characterized by the versatility of its major figures, the main *arti del disegno* (as Vasari calls them), i.e., painting, sculpture, architecture, should be treated together, so as to compose a historical *tableau* where not only each one of those arts receives its due, but where they are shown (and sometimes in a very unexpected and astonishing way) to be interdependent. As Professor Hartt underscores, while there is no scarcity of English histories of Italian Renaissance painting, or sculpture, there has existed up to now no volume dealing with all three of them. This gap he undertakes to fill, and with results which attest to his mastery and to his penetrating insights into, at times, unexplored associations. Nor does he ever lose sight of the relations which obtain between Italy itself (the land, agriculture, types of population, climatic conditions, regional differences, etc.) and the art produced in that country; thus he gives concrete and brilliant confirmation of Goethe's dictum that whoever "wishes to understand the poet [i.e., the artist] should betake himself to the poet's native land." Nor can any critic, however carping, dispute the rightness of Professor Hartt's decision to treat at length revolutionary figures and major movements "rather than to include certain minor masters, no matter how delightful their works may be" (*Foreword*). He admits to a Tuscan (or rather to a Florentine) bias which (he says with a charmingly humorous smile) he "would be willing to relinquish if it could be proved that the Renaissance originated anywhere else" (*Foreword*). He is defending himself against the same criticism formulated against Vasari when he remarks that, despite his Tuscan bias, he has tried to be fair to other Italian *Kunstlandschaften*, but may be

castigated for having omitted ... Torriti and Rusuti, Poppa and Borgognone, Mazzolino and Ortolano, Romanino and Moretto, Bartolomeo and Alvise Vivarini" (*ibid.*). The controlling criterion, it is opportune to repeat, has been emphasis on major figures and movements, on relative importance and quality. And he cuts the sinews of the Tuscanocentric insinuation by remarking that it was precisely because of his being guided by that criterion, that he had to pass over such Tuscans as Pacino di Bonaguida, Giovanni del Biondo, Luca di Tomè, Taddeo di Bartolo, Bartolomeo di Giovanni, Neroccio, Agostino di Duccio, Mino da Fiesole, Bacchiacca, and Ridolfo del Chirlandaio" (*ibid*).

I find Professor Hartt's plea in favour of iconology, as a discipline distinct from aesthetics, utterly convincing. He states that "aesthetically, of course, a work of art is no less interesting if we do not know what it represented. But a knowledge of its meaning can admit us into realms of experience, in both the personality of the artist and the period to which he was speaking, that would otherwise have been inaccessible." He adds that "such knowledge can also open our eyes to previously unobserved qualities of form and color in the work of art. And it can tell us much about why the artist did certain things the way he did – and even, at times, give us a flash of insight into the forces which cause styles to change or disappear, and new ones to take their places" (*ibid.*).

The reader may notice in the passage just quoted the "profound impression" which, by the admission of Professor Hartt himself, the theories of Panofski left on him; just as in Hartt's decision to treat only the major figures and movements, one might sense a mild reaction, perhaps, to Berenson's fondness for the re-discovery and re-evaluating of "minor" masters.

A most interesting and original aspect of Hartt's book I find to be represented by what he calls his "tentative ideas," which he proposes "more completely to expound elsewhere, supported by all the necessary evidence." Limitations of space prevent here a variety of exemplifications. I shall confine myself to drawing the reader's attention to what Hartt says about Botticelli (p. 281), and in particular about his later works. In reply to the question: "What accounts for Botticelli's present standing, which has endured for three generations, and seems unlikely to diminish?" "Partly," observes Hartt, "it is because Botticelli, more than any other master in Italian art – more even than Cimabue, his greatest predecessor in that vein – knew what line could accomplish" (*ibid.*). But partly also (and here is one of the ideas which Professor Hartt terms "tentative," but it is an idea which is highly tempting and, substantially, in my opinion, quite correct, although as Hartt emphasizes, seldom admitted) "it is because, in Botticelli's later works ... he achieved a sense of fatality so forbidding as to become oppressive. But the hardness, so nakedly evident in Botticelli's last style, underlies the drawing and organization of all of his pictures, whatever the apparent languor of the figures he paints" (p. 281). Here is a straight "jab" at Walter Pater, "the prince of Victorian aesthetes": "It would be a great error to consider Botticelli ever weak, or to allow the veil of sentimentality drawn over his personality in the Victorian era, to mask in any degree the rigor of his style" (*ibid.*).

In the attempt to bring out the originality of Hartt's ideas in this immense panorama, I find myself overwhelmed by an *embarras de richesses.* Tremendously interesting are the paragraphs devoted to the influence of L. B. Alberti's treatise *De Pictura,* "the first known treatise on painting as distinguished from handbooks of shop-practice, like Cennino Cennini's *Libro dell'Arte*" (p.194). Hartt emphasizes: "In many respects Alberti's manifesto

harmonizes with the art of Masaccio ... but it comes far closer to the painting of Fra Filippo Lippi and Fra Angelico, whom Alberti must have known personally. The new perspective governs Fra Angelico's *Annunciation* in the San Marco corridor – as distinguished from his pre-Albertian treatment of the same subject at Cortona – as well as the entire spatial system of the San Marco altarpiece. The frequent use by both Fra Filippo and Fra Angelico of the foreground figures ... the copiousness and variety of their compositions, and their sensitive analysis of the reception of light, correspond to Alberti's principles.... By the end of the century, some of the classical subjects he recommends were actually adopted ... by Botticelli.

"In the 1430s and 1440s, the two surviving giants of early Quattrocento Florentine sculpture, Ghiberti and Donatello, underwent striking changes of style, fully in keeping with Alberti's new doctrine, if not always with the details of his formulae...." (p.196).

Fascinating are the condensed histories of the posthumous reputations (*Nachleben*) of certain masters whose intrinsic value the tides of aesthetic taste have caused alternately to surface or to sink. As an instance, let me quote Hartt's account of the "critical vicissitudes" undergone by Ghirlandaio. "When the Quattrocento was rediscovered in earnest by nineteenth century critics," Hartt writes, "Ghirlandaio's meticulous and convincing view of the life about him impressed a generation which never quite understood Masaccio and cast only a scornful glance in the direction of Uccello and Piero della Francesca. Then came the revolution of '*Form*' in the wake of Cézanne, Picasso, and the Cubists, and that of '*Expression*' after Van Gogh, Rouault, and Nolde; and Ghirlandaio fell from grace a second time.... So Ghirlandaio – who, to Ruskin, was the master of painting in Quattrocento Firenze – dwindled to minor significance in twentieth-century eyes. Gradually, in the last two decades, Ghirlandaio's real qualities have become appreciated again. After closer study, his art has shown at least three important characteristics, any one of which should guarantee his permanent position."

Hartt sums them up as follows: "He had the freshest and most consistent color sense of any Florentine painter of his day; he was closely familiar with the achievements of his contemporaries in the field of architecture, and was thus able to compose figures and architectural spaces into a complex unity beyond that achieved by Quattrocento painters anywhere in Italy; and finally, in his rendering of human beings, his reserve veils an unsurpassed delicacy in the analysis of character" (p. 304).

Here and there, a curious inversion of current judgments is to be noticed; but Hartt knows whereof he is speaking. He finds, for instance, that in one case (contrary to the *vulgata opinio*) it is not Raphael who imitates Michelangelo, but vice versa. In the latter's *Conversion of St. Paul,* "in the foreground, the blinded Saul, shortly to become the apostle Paul, one of Michelangelo's most beautiful figures," is "clearly suggested by Raphael's blinded Heliodorus" (p. 578). Professor Hartt is known to be a world authority on Giulio Romano; it is therefore immensely stimulating to hear him discuss the problem of the Titian-Michelangelo relationship. He writes (p. 542): "Titian's first contact with the Roman artistic vocabulary was at second hand, through the person of Giulio Romano, still working in Mantua ... in the huge, heavily muscled figures who battle and tumble through and out of Titian's *Cain Killing Abel, Sacrifice of Isaac,* and *David and Goliath* (Sacristy of Santa Maria della Salute, Venice) there is more than an echo of Giulio Romano's giants, not to speak of his later ceiling paintings." (p. 542).

As a model of investigation of the craftmanship of a painter, I would point out Hartt's account of that of Tintoretto (p.553-54); but throughout Hartt's book, in effect, such investigations are standard features and are made with unsurpassed competence and scrupulously technical exactitude. Certain *rapprochements* indicated by Hartt are as astonishing as they are corresponding to the facts. See, for instance, the arresting parallel between Angelico and Zurbarán (p.185), Antonello da Messina and Caravaggio (p.223).

Equally enlightening are Hartt's explanations of works of sculpture and architecture. What Hartt has to say concerning Donatello's relief sculpture is most instructive. "A cross-section of Donatello's *St. George and the Dragon* would be illegible, a mere series of shapeless bumps and hollows. All of Donatello's experiments in the optically conceived details of his statues come to a climax in this relief. Its projections and depressions are subtly manipulated so as to attract light and cast shadows. Donatello's relief sculpture no longer corresponds to the idea of the object, nor to the object as we know it, but exclusively to the image of the object that light casts upon the retina. There could be no more crucial distinction; for in it, is manifest the division between medieval and modern art" (p.138).

The chapters of Professor Hartt's volume grouped under *Cinquecento* constitute the climax of this book, and deal with the High Renaissance in Florence, Rome, Venice, and the Mainland; the crowning point of this section is the part entitled *Michelangelo and the Maniera* (. 574 ff.). A welcome feature is that the exegesis of each work of art is accompanied by a photographic reproduction of it (over 800 of them, many in superb color).

Hartt's interpretations of Leonardo, Raffaello, Michelangelo, and Titian are gauges of the full measure of his stature as an art historian. The book is equipped with all the *realia* necessary to the reader utilizing it: glossary, chronological chart, substantial bibliography, and Index. The publishers deserve congratulations for the pains they have taken in producing a volume which is, in itself, a thing of beauty, and the finest of the histories of Italian Renaissance art produced in America.

ELIO GIANTURCO, *Washington, D.C.*

Aldo Scaglione. *The Classical Theory of Composition: From Its Origins to the Present.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1972. University of North Carolina Studies in Comparative Literature 53. Pp. 447. $15.

This book, as impressive as it is wide-ranging, furnishes a broad survey of "composition" in its rhetorical sense, "the stylistic criteria of sentence structure as first theorized in antiquity under that term and, as such, regularly transmitted through the centuries down to our own day." The investigation of this topic leads Scaglione into larger considerations of rhetoric and grammar, and the book emerges finally as a historical survey of theories of style, an examination of "the whole approach to the problem of expression."

Throughout this work is marked by a thorough comprehension of scholarship of the most pleasing kind, so that when Scaglione is not developing new theses of his own he is engaged in providing rewarding syntheses of both primary and secondary material. Moreover the author's depth of acquaintance with recent continental scholarship will make the book especially valuable for readers whose primary language is English and who may,

therefore, be unfamiliar with, say, Morpurgo Tagliabue's study of the origins of baroque or Dámaso Alonso's provocative suggestions about the relationships between Petrarchan rhetoric and that of poets, such as the metaphysicals, generally thought of as anti-Petrarchist. Scholars interested in the development of English prose style in the Renaissance will find thorough and judicious consideration given to the studies of M. W. Croll and his followers, for Scaglione's broad overview allows him to substantiate anew much of Croll's thesis about the development of English plain style and to point out places where Croll's arguments are weak or need discrimination.

While Scaglione emphasizes two periods as crucial stages in his survey – antiquity and the French eighteenth century – there is also not only an informative discussion of the Renaissance, but the book as a whole serves the important function of placing Renaissance stylistic concerns into a larger historical framework. And within its treatment of the Renaissance, there are any number of observations which offer valuable insights into the period's ways of thinking about style. For example, Scaglione documents how "the placing of elocution at the centre of the rhetorician's attention produced in the second half of the sixteenth century a new art of elocution, a sort of stylistics different from rhetoric as such, whose peculiar task had been to teach the modes of eloquent reasoning" – but rather than viewing this change "from substance to ornate form" as somehow decadent, he perceptively observes that its real significance is the resulting shift of attention "from logic to psychology, from reasoning per se to emotional understructures" (p.144).

The Classical Theory of Composition is far-reaching enough that not only scholars interested in its primary topic of word-order, but anyone interested in the history of or the importance of rhetoric, or in the development of style, will find the book worth reading. At the same time, while the work provides a wealth of background information, it will not always be easy going for a reader without some previous familiarity with the rhetorical tradition, presuming as it does a working knowledge of concepts such as Ramism. Still Scaglione has the ability to approach his materials in a way that makes even the most recondite aspects of this study seem fascinating to writer and reader alike.

Ultimately the most exciting aspect of a work like this is the opportunity it provides to see the historical interplay of ideas. Chomsky, for example, acknowledges his debt to the Port-Royal grammarians, but in Scaglione's book one can trace his ideas further back – to the Renaissance attempts of men such as Scaliger to formulate a general theory of grammar, even to the Alexandrian grammarians, who thought the structure of language was analogous to the laws of human thought. Or, reading about Bernardo Tomitano, one wonders if William Carlos Williams ever knew that in proclaiming "no ideas but in things" he was unconsciously echoing this sixteenth century rhetorician: "Things make men wise; words only make them seem so."

RUSSELL M. BROWN, *Lakehead University*

Jerome Roche. *Palestrina.* London: Oxford University Press, 1971. Pp. 60. $3.75.

The nine volumes published to date in the series *Oxford Studies of Composers* include four of particular interest to students of the Renaissance: Gilbert Reaney on Machaut, Paul Doe

on Tallis, Dennis Arnold on Marenzio and Jerome Roche on Palestrina.

These are slim books. The Palestrina study is accomplished in forty-seven pages of concentrated material, a good deal of which is taken up with printing the fifty-one musical examples. Roche devotes one chapter to the Masses. In it are contained his principal analyses. The succeeding chapter is a cursory treatment of Palestrina as a composer of motets. This the author effects by comparative references to the Renaissance repertoire, but reaches an indefinite conclusion in such a shapeless fashion as to suggest less the scholar who has exhausted the logic of his thesis, more the lecturer who has exhausted his allotted time. A neater chapter on the Hymns, Magnificats and Lamentations is followed by an even briefer consideration of the madrigals (four pages, including seven staves of examples).

The freedom and ease of delivery desirable, and possible, within the limitations of space imposed in the series have been demonstrated by Reaney in his very fluid *Machaut*; the balance between the scrutiny of an individual composer's stylistic peculiarities and the fitting of these into the mainstream of his life and times was a notable contribution of Doe's *Tallis*. When Roche announces that his object is to project Palestrina "against the background of his contemporaries and predecessors, and to show him as one among several great masters of the art of polyphony" (p. 7), he is casting his net wide, too wide for success in this particular series. There is room neither for the broad sweep of the sixteenth century panorama required by the initiate student nor for the sustained microscopic analysis demanded by the researcher. There is not even space for an adequate appraisal of Palestrine as a Roman polyphonist (see review by Lewis Lockwood, *The Musical Times*, April 1972, pp. 364-365).

In the course of the chapters interesting analogies are drawn and illustrated, usually with conviction. Thus in Ex. 30 (p. 34) can be seen how the identical rhythm pattern forces the mannered upward thrust of both *Surge illuminare* by Palestrina and *Surgens Jesu* by Lassus, but proceeds to achieve effect in two different ways: the Lassus, by the immediacy of the angular line, the Palestrina by the euphonious accumulation of smooth contours.

Nevertheless the book remains unsatisfactory, not a self-sufficient text. Although it would not be necessary to erect an elaborate encyclopaedic codification of contrapuntal devices as, for example, in H. K. Andrew's analysis of the technique of William Byrd, something more must be offered than the assumptions of the reader's knowledge implied by such recurring tags as "Josquin-like" and "English habit." The author has affirmed that "it is to students and scholars that my book is to a considerable extent aimed" (*Times Literary Supplement*, March 24, 1972, p.337). Both will expect more of the topic than was permitted by the restricted scope of the *Oxford Studies*, and neither student nor scholar needs to deal again with the easily accessible passages from Grout, Lang and Reese that use up half of the disappointing three-and-a-half-page Conclusion: especially disappointing when hardly a single Palestrina scholar of our time has been cited in the previous chapters either for reference or debate, and Roche's conclusions themselves are unoriginal – "He was a conservative in his deliberate preference for writing Masses, whose abstract text he could clothe in equally abstract polyphony...." (p.52); "perhaps it was really a case of the character of the man himself – a lover of rigorous discipline and craftsmanlike order who recoiled from overstatement" (p. 49).

The List of Works (or better, of publications up to 1650) is relatively wasted copy: seven pages which could have been better employed to carry an expanded chapter or a checklist

of published performing editions. The researcher will go to *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* for source bibliography, the student to *Groves Dictionary* for works and the *New Oxford History of Music* IV, Chapter VI, for concise survey and bibliography. There is no Index, a lack which is a nuisance when attempting to correlate Roche's hurried sequences of references to Arcadelt, Byrd, Clemens, Crecquillon, G. Gabrieli, Gombert, Goudimel, Josquin, Lassus, Morales, Richafort, Tallis, Willaert and Victoria.

The style fluctuates between uninformative subjectivity: "The 7-6-5 cadence that ends his [Victoria's] Kyrie is warmer in spacing than Palestrina's in Kyrie I of the *Missa Aeterne Christe Munera*" (p.15) and dreadful dust: "A sense of clarity in articulation is present everywhere, whether in the ternary shape of the Kyrie, with the sections ending in F, C, and F respectively; in the plain four-bar phrase that Palestrina makes of line 3 of the hymn in Kyrie II; or in the Josquin-like repetitions between bars 6 and 12 of the Gloria or between bars 22 and 28 of the Credo" (p.13). The rapid skimming of material that thrusts the eye over large gobs of such writing leaves the reader gasping for air, and for really important data (see p.35). Occasional rhetorical flourishes and piquant sallies – the "kill-joys of the Council of Trent" (p.18) – do not contribute to the quality of the prose, and being intrusions into the otherwise objective musicologese they do not produce the cumulative effect which, from the pen of a lively stylist like Arthur Hutchings, can create a vivid passage without sacrificing the scholarship.

One is put off what is an often well-selected collection of seminar notes by Roche's over-enthusiasm for his comparative, non-eulogistic approach, as if few other authors of our century saw in Palestrina's output anything but "a homogeneous model for strict counterpoint" (p.9). But it is now well accepted that gone are the days when "the celebrated light of music," as Fux hailed him in the eighteenth century, could be viewed solely as an arbiter of contrapuntal rules. Enquiry has penetrated to the sources of that power which had led so many to echo the awe expressed by Schumann: "At times it really sounds like the music of the spheres." Even the cataloguing of individual detail that went into Jeppesen's masterful *The Style of Palestrina and the Dissonance* was in part a tabulation of comparative research into the works of his subject's contemporaries and predecessors (Jeppesen's material on pedal dissonance and the occurrence of augmented fifth chords gives more credence to the passages from the *Missae in Festis Apostolorum* which Roche cites as implied unrefined practices (p.30)). And that most succinct summary of Palestrina in the modern view, by Anthony Milner in Vol. 2 of *The Pelican History of Music* (pp.174-175), adumbrates the spirit of "juster appraisal" (to quote the cover blurb) in which Roche wrote his contribution.

A much more extensive monograph is required. Henry Coates wrote of the liturgical function of Palestrina's art: "the music has been evolved out of a situation instead of being composed for it ..." Even so must a comparative study of this scope be shaped by the demands of its subject matter. Hopefully Dr. Roche might be able to publish a second book in which he could more completely realize his concern for the art of the Renaissance polyphonists.

WALTER H. KEMP, *Waterloo Lutheran University*

Joseph L. Allaire, ed. Marguerite d'Angouleme Reine de Navarre. *Le Miroir de l'Ame Pecheresse.* Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1972. Pp. 105.

This critical edition is the third such edition of Marguerite d'Angoulême's poetry to appear in the last two years and attempts, like the other two (those of R. Marichal, *La Coche,* and G. Dottin, *Chansons Spirituelles*) to provide the reader with a sound basis for work on the Queen's poetry.

The collation of all available editions of *Le Miroir* has been done in detail and is a most useful tool for anyone studying the text of this important work. Unlike R. Marichal, Allaire has not taken a position on the question of the authority of the text. He reproduces the first edition (A) despite the fact that three subsequent editions (D, E and F) claim to have been revised according to the Queen's own manuscript. The reason given for this: "on peut mieux remarquer l'évolution de la forme des poèmes" suggests that not only do the editions follow one another chronologically, but that each subsequent one is built on its immediate predecessor; a doubtful assertion to say the least. The work is abstracted, in fact, from its creator, and we are left to judge on the question of authority, which is on the part of Allaire a realistic, if uncommitted stance.

Less successful, perhaps, are the "Eclaircissements" which are not particularly enlightening. Some comments seem purely gratuitous, such as that on lines 132-133, "Allusions à sa vie avant sa crise de conscience," an "éclaircissement" which might apply to many lines in the poem, or the remark on line 659: "Le monde, la chair, Satan ont toujours été groupés ensemble dans la littérature de spiritualité comme les trois sources de tentation"! More serious are the comments on lines 859-860. The meaning of the word "Threnes" should not be difficult to decipher for anyone possessing even such a minimal tool as *Le Petit Larousse,* where the meaning is given and the reference made clear immediately. This would seem inexcusable in view of the fact that the editor is attempting to prove that Marguerite used Lefèvre's translation of the Bible. What more telling indication than the "savant" use of a Greek term? Again, the comment on line 1375 that the editors of the editions "D E F G H I J ont mieux compris" when they substituted "altitude" for the "celsitude" of A, "mot inventé par Marguerite," seems to suggest that the editors knew better than the author, whose attributed intervention in editions D, E and F is again implicitly denied.

Although minor questions of formal consistency would scarcely distract one from admiring an excellent edition, in this case such recurring inconsistencies in numbering as the two consecutive references "Vv. 1201-1206" and "Vv. 1207-11," and the typographical error "rettachent" add to a general impression of rather hasty publication.

HANNAH FOURNIER, *University of Waterloo*

Frank L. Borchardt. *German Antiquity in Renaissance Myth.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1971. Pp. ix, 356. $13.75.

The aim of this book, to quote from the blurb on the dust-jacket, is to reveal "something of what Germans in the Renaissance thought of themselves and their history"; and this

the author sets out to do by means of "a broad sampling of 'histories' written between the Council of Constance (1418) and the death of Aventinus (1534)." Thus much of what he has to offer will be primarily of interest to the student of Renaissance historiography. Yet from various remarks thrown out in the course of the exposition, we are clearly meant to view it as a contribution to German studies as well, and this review is accordingly undertaken more from the standpoint of the German specialist.

In the wider sense, of course, the writing of history is a branch of literature. History no less than the epic or the novel has to do with "telling a story," and the great historians, from Thucydides down to Gibbon and Ranke, have certainly possessed many of the qualities of the creative writer. Then again, it would be difficult to dispute Borchardt's contention that "myth, imagination, legend, and symbol as an intrinsic constituent of the intellectual life of the Renaissance" (p. 6) ought to be of interest to the student of literature. And yet to read on through the synopses conveniently supplied by the author is to be continually assailed by doubts as to whether this disparate mass of legend and myth, concocted for the most part out of classical antiquity and medieval chronicle, really deserves to be elevated to the status of "literature." Or perhaps these "histories" might justify the claim if they were read within the more leisurely context of the original. But this, too, raises a problem. Most of them, not surprisingly, are in Latin and therefore not properly part of the corpus of German literature.

Already in the introductory first chapter there are several debatable assertions which, in turn, call for a closer look at Borchardt's methodological premises. It is, for example, undoubtedly correct to cite Emperor Maximilian's interest in the transcription of medieval literature as the main reason why only one copy of the epic *Gudrun* has come down to us. But to proceed from there and maintain that there was therefore a "disrupted heroic tradition" (p. 4) among the Germans of the 15th century is to ignore, among other things, the tremendous popularity of a work like the *Nibelungenlied* which held its audience right up to the eve of the Reformation. Similarly, Borchardt is unduly hard on the Hohenstaufens when he castigates their ambitions as "irrational, impractical, and indefensible" (p. 5). As Haller and other historians have pointed out, there were some perfectly good reasons why the German emperors of the 12th century, with their own domains lying on what was then the periphery of Western civilization, should have set about bringing a large part of Italy under their control. Indeed, to judge otherwise is to set aside the reality of medieval politics, a matter of some consequence in a work dealing so extensively with the imperial idea which, after all, was not just a myth but also found expression in an actual political institution. Nor can I see much point in belabouring historians of German literature for generally preferring the term "Humanism" in their accounts of this period (p. 9). The short answer is, surely, that "Renaissance" has a considerably wider connotation, embracing the formidable achievements of that age in the pictorial and plastic arts; and these were fields in which the contribution of the Italians far outweighs that of the Germans. "Humanism," on the other hand, refers more specifically to intellectual and literary trends which, by definition, remain the prime concern of the germanist. And so one could go on.

The main expository part of the book, too, contains some minor inaccuracies, such as a reference to "the prestigious archbishopric (!) of Bamberg" (p. 276) or the statement that Rudolf von Ems (who, in point of fact, appears to have made a name for himself by about 1230) flourished between 1250 and 1254 (p. 244). And while on the subject of Rudolf von

Ems, it is worth pointing out that already in the later 13th century the idea of comparing and evaluating different accounts of the same events, in many ways the hallmark of the modern historian, was "in the air": witness the way in which this prolific Swabian poet set about compiling both the *Alexander* and the *Weltchronik*.

As already indicated, the greater part of this book consists of a summary of the many compilations from the 15th and early 16th century that undertook to provide the Germans with an account, usually more fictitious than factual, of their origins as a nation, and this is of considerable interest and importance inasmuch as we are introduced to a whole range of works with which even the most erudite colleague in German studies can hardly be familiar in toto. And some of this material, it should be added, actually pertains to Germanic philology in the strict sense, for the German Humanists showed great ingenuity in devising etymologies for their own mother-tongue. Far-fetched and implausible as their accounts of the past strike us today, they were avidly read by contemporaries, as evidenced by the number of editions that some of them went through. A few of them were still being printed in the 17th century. Indeed, when it comes to regaling the public with fantastic and unlikely tales, most of the Renaissance historiographers marshalled before us on the pages of Borchardt's book seem hardly different from their predecessors, the medieval chroniclers, and this, I think, would be my parting criticism. In his determination to depict the historical writings of the German Humanists as "a treasure-trove of imaginative materials," Borchardt passes all too lightly over the positive achievements of such figures as Konrad Peutinger and Beatus Rhenanus who, whatever their limitations, played no small part in bringing a new historical dimension to our view of the past.

DAVID BRETT-EVANS, *University of Toronto*

NEWS

The Pacific Northwest Renaissance Conference will hold its annual meeting March 15-17, 1974 at the Regina campus of the University of Saskatchewan in Regina. The theme of this conference will be "Renaissance: Age of Paradox and Ambiguity." The conference, organized by M. L. Kovacs, Chairman, and M. Bergbusch, Secretary, will feature a special display of Renaissance art in the Norman Mackenzie Art Gallery, a student production of a Renaissance play and an accompanying performance of Renaissance music.