

magistry exercised by theologians and the one exercised by the Holy Orders as the foundations of the debate between Cajetan and Jacques Almain on the Fifth Lateran Council as well as of early modern gallicanism in general. Schmitz links the gallican ecclesiology to Reformation theology and convincingly shows that the first was developed further, influenced by the latter.

In the fourth section, five authors (Giorgio Caravale, Elena Valeri, Jean-Louis Quantin, Miguel Gotor, Jean-Pascal Gay) present case studies from the history of censorship between France and Rome. Each of these highly interesting studies reveals the convoluted tangle of political, theological, and personal motives—even more complicated by the two different styles—which could promote or prevent the prohibition of a book. Thus, political or personal conflicts from outside the censorial debate could have a say in the decision on what was regarded as orthodox or heterodox.

Finally, three articles are dedicated to the relationship between Venice and France in the period of the interdict 1606/07 (Corrado Pin, Sylvio Hermann de Franceschi, Antonella Barzani), demonstrating that a common interest in an alternative ecclesiology made both the republic and the kingdom partners in the arguments with Rome. The book's articles are written in French and Italian. Unfortunately, the book provides short summaries only in the respective language, which may make this valuable publication less accessible to the anglophone world. The reader might also miss some remarks on the Spanish influence, though this would open a new field of research. Nevertheless, the wide variety of perspectives and subjects in this volume (often already known in principle) sheds bright light on the shaping of different Catholic styles in the early modern period. This renders the book a worthwhile reading for anyone interested in early modern Catholicism.

Bernward Schmidt, *Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt*

*Death Be Not Proud: The Art of Holy Attention.* David Marno.

Class 200: New Studies in Religion. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016. xii + 316 pp. \$40.

---

In his introduction, David Marno states that “Donne’s devotional verse has still not seen a book-length study” (31). *Death Be Not Proud* would fill that void in its consideration of the Holy Sonnets, or rather, in constructing its argument around a single Holy Sonnet. Of its seven chapters, the first, second, and seventh expound this Holy Sonnet and envelop a four-chapter core that recovers the art of holy attention. Understanding holy attention, the cultivation of an “undistracted turn to God” (88), is, according to Marno, the key to unlocking Donne’s Holy Sonnets. These poems constitute devotional thought experiments, “poetic meditations in preparation for prayer” (2), by which the speakers somehow emerge from distraction to attend to God in pure prayer.

For Marno, the Holy Sonnets reconcile theology and poetry, the apparent clash of the doctrinal and the creative—religious givenness and poetic invention—by staging the speakers perceiving the given as gift and inventing faith as proof. A human creature is a “thanksgiving machine” (65) and the Holy Sonnets are properly thanksgiving poems where Donne’s speakers finally acknowledge the given as gift. To strengthen his case, Marno contextualizes the famous words in Donne’s thanksgiving sermon on Psalm 6 about a poem’s “force” being “left to the shutting up” (57).

Marno is wary of Louis Martz and Barbara Lewalski’s dependence upon confessional identity for deciphering the Holy Sonnets. His own approach avoids this tack by arguing for Donne’s responsiveness to post-Reformation Christianity’s “collective revival and popularization of devotional techniques . . . practiced primarily by monks and the clergy” (107). The tracing of the intellectual history of holy attention across the book’s middle is its most sound and rewarding feature. The inquiry’s scope encompasses Stoic ethical concepts of *prosochē* and *apatheia*, Pauline theology, Clementine and Evagrius’ formulations of asceticism, John Cassian’s monastic regulative ideal, Thomist discussion of mental versus vocal prayer, Ignatian devotional exercises, and Augustinian meditations on distraction and *extentus*, “more durable, more focused” attention (140).

The application of this inheritance of holy attention to Donne’s poetics is the book’s weakest aspect. Marno describes how “every Holy Sonnet uses the sonnet form to drive itself toward its *volta* and closure; that is, toward a poetic conversion and the ensuing grace” (177). However, not every Holy Sonnet resolves so smartly from resentment into thanksgiving. A one-size-fits-all framework jars with the fascinating mixture and discomforting caprices and quirks of this group of lyrics: “To E. of D. with six holy Sonnets” likens these poems to Nilotic “strange creatures.” Chapter 6 explains the poems’ characteristic tonal dissonance by pressing into service the biting rhetorical trope of *sarcasmos*, mockery of the flesh. The work charting Christianity’s appropriation of this classical trope to express an ethos against the world, flesh, and devil is again illuminating, but its function in explicating the Holy Sonnets less so. Given the monograph’s tight focus and the manageability of secondary material on the Holy Sonnets, analyses of individual lyrics puzzlingly omit substantial engagement with, and sometimes any reference to, signal close readings that have gone before. The exclusion from Marno’s discussion of “If faythfull Soules” of Robert Reeder’s 2010 *John Donne Journal* essay, the only essay wholly dedicated to this sonnet, is an oversight, especially when both critics note resemblances between Donne’s speaker and Hamlet as they angst over their fathers’ ghosts.

Chapter 7 retreads the well-traveled path of Donne’s treatment of the resurrection and the possible affinity between corruptible and incorruptible bodies. When, after a 130-page interval, this last chapter returns to the titular Holy Sonnet, Marno asserts that “Donne used poetry as a devotional technology to create the spiritual body” (211). The general claim is that the Holy Sonnets operate as devotional-poetic “engines” (211);

the particular claim for the book's central, much scrutinized Holy Sonnet is that the poem, by fully attending to death as its subject, overcomes "death itself, . . . distraction itself" (215), and "provides a practical, experiential proof for the mortality of death by showing that distraction may be overcome" (217). For all its eloquence, this interpretation, essentially the study's profit and punchline, is belief-beggar, if not, to submit another play on *attentio*, overstrained and overstretched, "like butter that has been scraped over too much bread."

Russell M. Hillier, *Providence College*

*Members of His Body: Shakespeare, Paul, and a Theology of Nonmonogamy.*  
Will Stockton.

New York: Fordham University Press, 2017. x + 178 pp. \$25.

---

When Diana, Princess of Wales admitted in a television interview that her marriage to Prince Charles had been unfaithful, she confided to the journalist that there "were three of us in this marriage, so it was a bit crowded." Diana's unwelcome second partner was her husband's mistress, now wife, Camilla Parker Bowles. But as Will Stockton's excellent and politically astute book argues, three was hardly a crowd in the early modern world. Men and women in Shakespeare's England, nominally Protestant but still attached to a Catholic understanding of sacramental marriage, found in Paul's letter to the Ephesians, chapter 5, a marital theology that was fundamentally plural: husband and wife became "one flesh," and that single entity joined the many-membered body of Christ (Ephesians 5:30).

*Members of His Body* reads four Shakespeare plays in light of what Stockton regards as the persistence into Elizabethan and Jacobean England of a Pauline theology of marriage. The apostle Paul (or the authors of the New Testament who wrote under his name) defined marriage as a *mysterion*—translated as sacrament, mystery, or secret, depending on one's confessional persuasion—that enabled a superior form of embodied membership of the citizenry of Christ. "To what extent," asks Stockton, "does Shakespeare figure Christians as united to one another and to God, in the body, through marriage?" And how—this is the line of polemical steel in the book—might these questions help us think about "post-Reformation retrenchment of marriage in Christian, especially Evangelical, body politics?" (4). Post-Reformation is Stockton's delicate term for present-day: his book is also a corrective to the cherry-picked readings of the Bible that empower modern fundamentalist Christian politics, and it offers a determinedly queer recalibration of Christian marriage.

But the present is a subtle thread in these refreshing and compact historicist readings. His purpose is to tease out the implications of a theology of Pauline marriage in texts (including three non-Shakespeare prose utopias) that deal in gender relations and