(1589) de Juste Lipse. Cet article examine avec finesse l’influence de chaque écrivain sur l’autre, surtout en ce qui concerne les citations et l’art de la brièveté dans leur prose, mais il révèle aussi que Montaigne et Juste Lipse ont tous les deux mal compris la réaction de l’autre au stoïcisme. D’une part, dans l’édition de 1588 de ses Essais, Montaigne a exprimé moins d’admiration pour les stoïciens que dans la première édition de 1580. Juste Lipse n’a pas compris ce changement dans les opinions de Montaigne. D’autre part, Montaigne a mal jugé les efforts de Juste Lipse pour réconcilier le stoïcisme et le christianisme.

La qualité des communications faites au colloque de Strasbourg sur Juste Lipse est toujours excellente. Les historiens de la peinture liront avec plaisir les essais de M. Morford et de F. Vuilleumier qui analysent le tableau Les quatre philosophes de Pierre-Paul Rubens, qu’on peut voir maintenant au Palazzo Pitti à Florence. Les quatre “philosophes” sont le peintre lui-même, son frère Philippe, Juste Lipse et un certain Jan van den Wouver. M. Morford et F. Vuilleumier examinent bien l’iconographie classique dans ce tableau et aussi l’image de son frère et de leur ami Juste Lipse, tous les deux morts quand Rubens a peint ce tableau en 1611, tableau que Rubens voulait laisser à la postérité. Dans un essai très intéressant, Jan Papy identifie 156 poèmes pour montrer que Juste Lipse imitait de très près des poètes latins. J. Papy croit que la poésie de Juste Lipse n’était pas suffisamment originale pour justifier une édition critique de ses poèmes.

Ce riche volume d’essais devrait encourager plus de chercheurs à étudier l’oeuvre méconnue de Juste Lipse, le dernier des grands érudits néolatins de la Renaissance.

EDMUND J. CAMPION, University of Tennessee


In recent years the fact of social diversity in English-speaking Western societies has prompted many readers of John Milton to begin thinking through the linguistic and cultural diversity so manifest in his writings. Milton lived before the imperial era during which he was made a twin pillar of English Literature, and he wrote English at a time when no one could have foreseen its dominance in the international marketplace. The creative ways in which his imagination brought several languages and cultures into contact with one another make his writings fruitful terrain for exploring some opportunities and some limits of multicultural performance. Elizabeth Sauer’s book is therefore brilliantly timely in its conception. It recognizes that the end of the millenium is an opportune moment for reconsidering Milton’s place in the layered history of Western thinking about the origins and implications of linguistic diversity.
Less learned than the splendid treatments of Milton’s handling of diverse languages recently published by Stella Revard and John Hale, *Barbarous Dissonance and Images of Voice* is a book of the moment. It offers an approach that is “self-consciously the product of a late twentieth-century perspective” (p. 161). Roundly condemning studies from a generation ago by Anne Ferry and Louis Martz, asserting that they imposed “monological” interpretations of *Paradise Lost* and made “claims to totalization” (p. 5), it invokes a “poststructuralist model of the inscription of voice and the deorignation of the already present” to study an authority that in Milton’s epics “is dispersed among multiple voices” (p. 7). Looming behind this dispersion is Genesis 11, the story of the Tower of Babel, handsomely evoked by a triple image on the cover of *Barbarous Dissonance*. Sauer observes that Milton’s great epic depicts Nimrod as the chief builder of the Tower and as the original monarch: his tyranny first generated the “barbarous dissonance” to which the epic narrator refers in Book VII, where the death of Orpheus is interpreted as having left only “images of voice” or echoes out of which revelers, like the builders of the unfinished tower, compose a “partial song.” (One would like to know, incidentally, what Milton and his contemporaries made of the fact that Genesis 10 envisages a world in which there were different languages even before the construction of Babel.)

Invoking Bakhtin to propel a study of epic is of course no easy feat. Sauer is not much interested in the literally different languages — Italian and Latin and Greek — that Milton wrote. She adapts Bakhtin against his own writing about “monological” epic to urge that *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* are “multivocal poems [that] interrogate dominant structures of authority” (p. 9). The adaptation turns out to generate two rather surprising claims: that the many voices of the epics are “characteristically Miltonic and yet present in spite of their author” (p. 13) and that they “resist the monological containment of the poems’ dominant narratives” (p. 3). Occasionally, Sauer suggests the possibility that Milton stages a variety of voices in order ultimately to assert control; and even as she praises him for including diverse voices, she concludes — at the center of her book — that when it came to represent gendered differences he failed.

Chapter 4, “The Gendered Hierarchy of Discourse,” treats in turn the “autobiographical” accounts ascribed by the narrator of *Paradise Lost* to Sin, Eve, and Adam. It cites examples from early modern writings to illustrate the frequency with which political disruption was represented in feminized terms. It incorporates a generalization that is then used to interpret Milton’s story of the first parents: “Western society has traditionally associated social disorder with female self-fashioning and changeability,” so that a woman’s “assertion of identity” is considered “unnatural to the point of being monstrous” (p. 98). From this perspective it is perhaps unsurprising that Sauer sees Milton’s God as “abetting rape.” The patriarchs “penetrate and colonize the private female sphere” (p. 98) and then require the woman “to participate in the symbolic order” in which it is acceptable for Adam to “rupture” Eve’s “lyrical space — the womb of historicism — in order to ensure its productivity” (p. 107). In short, the two central chapters bring into focus what is anomalous about Sauer’s development of her argument; whereas she seeks painstakingly to show that Milton’s epics orchestrate a variety of interpretations, her own readings tend to shut down the rich
interpretive possibilities latent in individual passages. There is no considering, for instance, what effects are set in motion by Milton’s having placed Eve’s account of her origins in a context where she recalls them playfully, suggesting to Adam the difference between her first impressions of him (“I didn’t think you were so cute”) from what she has come to find in him. And for all Sauer’s helpful discussion of how Milton’s depictions of Sin and Eve engage Ovidian precedents, vast differences are erased rather than probed. (Whereas Ovid’s gods punish Narcissus for rejecting human love, Milton’s God redirects Eve’s initial attraction to her own “human face divine,” and Eve subsequently expresses pleasure in the sweetness of a consummated relationship.) Sauer’s indictment of Milton’s patriarchs is a possible reading; yet it is presented without that openness to alternative possibilities that constitutes the most exhilarating feature of her larger argument.

The last two chapters provide some of the best reading of poetry in the book. Chapter 5 treats “Colonialism and Censorship in Paradise” and enhances our appreciation that “Milton represents paradise as dynamic and as accommodating of diversity and change,” not least when he makes “each voice contribute to the creation of a multifaceted truth” (p. 113). Finally, “The Voices of Nebuchadnezzar in Paradise Regained” deftly demonstrates how Milton drew on the Book of Daniel to make the temptation on the pinnacle a variation on the story of Babel’s Tower. Reading Nebuchadnezzar as a successor to Nimrod, Sauer proposes that Satan is their original and that his fall amounts to “the silencing of the single negating voice and the symbolic collapse of monarchy” (p. 138). Sauer is at her most inspired in condemning tyranny, and in this she pays apt homage to her author.

DAYTON HASKIN, Boston College


With this meticulous study, A. A. Den Hollander has made a major contribution to the history of printed works and their printers, providing an invaluable reference work that will assist scholars of the early Reformation of the Netherlands as well as specialists of the history of the book.

Den Hollander’s specific goal is to examine in considerable detail the sources and print history of the Dutch bible translations published between 1522 and 1545. Publication of vernacular bibles, especially relatively inexpensive New Testament editions, was a key component to the success of the Reformation. This is certainly the case in the Netherlands, home to many dynamic printing establishments (especially in