courage guerrier — ce qui d'ailleurs entraîne de constantes divergences d'opinions entre les devisants, chacun interprétant les nouvelles selon son point de vue de l'honneur. C. Winn souligne par ailleurs le danger de la prise de parole pour les femmes en ce qui a trait au corps et à la sexualité; ces deux sujets ne se voient d'ailleurs abordés ouvertement que par les devisants masculins. Elle signale, tout comme Nerina Clerici Balmas, que dans l'*Heptaméron* le langage sexuel se trouve suggéré et elle voit là une volonté de Marguerite de prendre une certaine distance avec le corps. Elle met alors l'accent sur l'idée que, si céder à ses pulsions sexuelles se révèle destructeur, ne pas les assouvir cause aussi des ravages. Il faut donc contrôler ses élans sexuels et ne pas mépriser son corps, car cela reviendrait à nier Dieu.

Cet ouvrage permet donc d'éclaircir un certain nombre de points importants sur les écrits de la reine de Navarre. Il faut finalement signaler que l'introduction est signée par Enea Balmas et que les auteurs des contributions sont présentés dans une notice biographique à la fin de l'ouvrage; celui-ci ne comporte toutefois ni bibliographie ni index.

HÉLÈNE LUCUIX, *Université de Montréal*

Anthony Milton. *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Anthony Milton's ambitious and original study, *Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought, 1600–1640*, explores the polemical debates within the English church in the early part of the seventeenth century. The work is divided into two halves: "Part One: The Church of Rome" traces the image of the Roman Catholic church over 40 years; "Part Two: The Reformed Churches" surveys the representation of foreign and domestic Protestant groups during the same period. Both parts show a struggle over the self-definition of the English church, with authors defining themselves (or the version of the English church which they would prefer) as the inverse of a perceived "other." Polemical labels of "popery" or "puritan," Milton argues, not only reflected but also actively exacerbated the divisions within the English church: "Polarization of opinion will often be seen to have been a *function* of polemical debate, rather than its trigger" (p. 5, emphasis Milton's). Moreover, the author argues that it was this polemic, rather than inclusivity, which created the Anglican *via media* when the common strategy of claiming to be both "Catholic and Reformed" acquired a radical twist in the hands of the Laudians. One is reminded (though not by a citation) of Michel Foucault's claim that identity is created in discourse.

In considering a historian who emphatically underlines the importance of controversy in forming ideas, it only makes sense to consider Milton's own position in recent historiographical debate. By choosing the same title as F.M.G. Higham's 1962 study, Milton positions himself *vis-à-vis* an earlier view of the pre-Civil War English church, and solidly in the revisionist camp, among those who wish to reinstate religion as a central thread in the web of causes to the English Civil War. While Milton provides his own encapsulated history of the revisionist stance, it is also worth noting that its direction was anticipated by Laurence Stone, who described his own *The Causes of the English Revolution, 1529–1642* as "multi-causal in its approach, laying as much stress on institutional defects and ideological passions as on social movements and economic changes" (p. 57). Milton positions himself as an eddy in the current of historiography which is returning to religious history as an explanation for the English Civil War.

Unlike some other revisionists and religious historians, however, Milton is not identifying a doctrinal binary as a cause for the English revolution, declaring instead that "the Roman and Protestant Churches were a good deal closer to each other in their doctrine than the polarized forms of religious controversy would suggest" (p. 372). Instead of laying the divisions in the English church at the feet of binary doctrinal differences, he argues that the breach between Laudians and Calvinists was precipitated by the failure of Laudians to invoke the symbols of a common, and commonly anti-papal, unity. Milton, in fact, goes to some lengths to define his terms in order to avoid even the perception of drawing binary distinctions between groups locked in conflict.

It might even be argued that Milton's study of religious thought in the years preceding the English Civil War is not a return to the religious *per se*. He shows little interest in examining how persons understood their relationships with God through justification, for instance. Rather, this study dissolves the religious into the political; or at least, into the political as broadly defined. Even here, though, Milton is not always consistent. He points out, for example, that the Church of England was widely acknowledged to be Calvinist "principally because of her doctrine of the eucharist, which disowned Lutheran consubstantiation — one of the fundamental divisions between the Lutheran and Calvinist world" (p. 385). Doctrinal imperatives certainly continued to function, as Milton recognizes. While there was a sound political rationale, recognized even by die-hard Calvinists, to unify with Lutheranism, "their reservations over Lutheran doctrines persisted" (p. 391). Nevertheless, Milton is insistent that doctrinal grounds are insufficient to explain the division between the churches: "The doctrine of the Two Churches, the papal Antichrist, the depiction of popery as a false religion — all these arguments sought to create an absolute doctrinal division which would correspond to the physical and political separation of the churches" (pp. 372–73). In this case, Milton's logic is clear: political imperatives come first, and doctrine merely responds. Unfortunately, Milton does not always maintain consistency with this position.

At times, Milton seems to be adopting a depth model to reconcile polemic and doctrine. He argues, for instance, that while ecumenical efforts to reconcile the Church of England with Greek Orthodoxy were “directed towards the needs of anti-papal polemic”; “in more candid moments” the English churchmen carrying on the negotiations expressed distrust. Beneath a veneer of polemical reasoning, in other words, deep divisions between the English and the Greek churches remained. Similarly, while James may have avoided mentioning some of his beliefs under particular circumstances, “there was no doubting the certainty with which he held them” (p. 122). Here it seems that James’s views form a sort of constant, imperturbably solid beneath the superficial flux of political poses. However, if one is to accept such doctrine as more permanent than politics, then I find it hard to imagine doctrines being produced by polemical exigency. Yet it seems necessary to accept such an emergence in order to agree with Milton that the ultimately internicine breach between Calvinism and Laudianism could result largely from the innovative inflection of a “common polemical strategy — claiming to be both Catholic and Reformed” (p. 527). In fairness to Milton, I should, of course, also recognize that he does make attempts throughout the work to reconcile the play of polemical strategies with doctrinal imperatives. That no such effort seems entirely conclusive merely indicates that a philosophical decision on this subject is outside the scope of Milton’s already ambitious work.

Moreover, if Milton is occasionally inconsistent, he merely reflects the struggles of the time which he chronicles, with its vexed debates on the distinction between doctrine and discipline, or which beliefs were to be considered “things indifferent” and which were touchstones of orthodoxy. Milton describes debates on whether the Roman church *had* errors, or *was* its errors. Against this background, we can see James’s efforts to clear a space for the political outside the religious and away from “medlers in matters of State and monarchy” (p. 292) as part of a general effort to renegotiate the bounds between the essential and the accidental. If Milton seems undecided on whether differences were doctrinal or polemical or both, he is not alone.

Milton’s inconsistency, in fact, may even be a measure of the greatness of his effort. He eschews simple and traditional divisions between religious groups. Likewise, he refuses the always powerful temptation to reduce his material to what would be entirely consistent with his thesis. In fact, given the depth and breadth of his research, it is dubious whether any single theory at all could be expected to cover it. Instead of concentrating on the relatively small amount of religious literature which has already been studied almost exhaustively, Milton expands his range to the whole of printed religious literature from 1600 to 1640. If only by forging into a vast and untapped realm of documentation, Milton’s effort is historiographically significant. As Milton admits, “The current work makes no claims to provide a comprehensive or definitive account of this rich and underexploited resource”

(p. 7), but it nevertheless does make a pretty impressive first foray. Milton's bibliography of primary printed sources runs to a staggering fifteen large, fine-printed pages, most of whose entries are only one-line long; the bibliography is complemented by twelve pages of secondary sources and three pages of primary manuscript sources. This work does not do the violence necessary to narrowly marshal the evidence towards proving its thesis. Nonetheless, its very catholicity, in the oldest sense of the term, assures it of a place on library shelves for decades to come. We can only hope that Milton inspires similarly energetic historians to explore the resources into which he has made impressive pioneering efforts, and that consulting *Catholic and Reformed* does not become a substitute for navigating through the forest of primary texts.

SEAN K. LAWRENCE, *University of British Columbia*

P. G. Stanwood, ed. *Of Poetry and Politics: New Essays on Milton and his World*. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 126, 1995. Pp. xxi, 333.

P. G. Stanwood's *Of Poetry and Politics* is an attempt to offer "a unified study illustrative of the best and most typical work on Milton today" (p. xv). The collection represents a selection of papers presented at the Fourth International Milton Symposium held in 1991. Far from being a random sampling of scholarship, the papers group themselves nicely into the three complementary areas of the volume's organization: Milton's prophetic voice, gender and personal identities, and politics. Drawing on various recent theoretical developments, these essays seek to contextualize Milton in terms of the complex social, political, and intellectual landscape of his time.

The first section of the volume, on Milton's prophetic voice, begins with three genre studies. Louis Martz argues that *The Reason of Church Government* follows the structural pattern of the biblical prophetic writings, a pattern that may also be traced in the *Second Defense* and *Paradise Lost*. John Hale's analysis of the Latin ode "To John Rouse" shows Milton's resistance to contemporary use of Latin verse to celebrate royal power; instead, Milton chose to praise a dutiful librarian who "stood for the prevailing of law and religion and conscience, even in time of civil war" (p. 32). In her study of *Lycidas*, Stella Revard adroitly reveals Milton's deployment of Pindaric conventions, first by exploring the use of "thematic figures and mythic digression" and subsequently by explaining how "the ostensible subject is different from its real one" (p. 36). The prophet's voice is also to be heard, according to Lee M. Johnson, in Milton's use of circles and other patterns of enclosure to create the illusion of innocence in Adam and Eve. The enclosure of the