Fonseca, one of that community's rabbis, in 1655. But Spinoza never mentions Herrera or his writings, and we have no idea whether or not he ever read him. As he tries to explain why Herrera's works did not make it into print in Amsterdam, a center for Jewish publishing in Europe, Beltrán says that "this fact could be explained by the widely extended animadversion to Kabbalah in the bosom of the Amsterdam Jewish community, especially showed by Saul Levi Mortera" (8). However, there were some Kabbalah enthusiasts among the Amsterdam Portuguese Jews, especially Rabbi Aboab. There was also Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel, who owned his own printing press and published whatever he wanted.

After a long, dense introduction that does not, in fact, really introduce either Herrera or his works, Beltrán turns to a number of philosophical themes in which he finds the influence of Herrera on Spinoza. Most revolve around the nature of substance and its causal relationship to the "modes" that (to use a kabbalistic term) "emanate" from it, as well as God as *causa sui* and the attributes that constitute its essence and the *amor Dei intellectualis* with which Spinoza's *Ethics* culminates. Beltrán argues, in contrast with other studies of an influence of Herrera upon Spinoza that tend to focus on Spinoza's earliest writings, that there is a discernable trace of Herrera's "syncretism of kabbalah and philosophy" in the *Ethics*.

The topic is, of course, fascinating, and Beltrán is an expert and erudite guide to Herrera's writings. Does he prove his case? I, for one, remain skeptical, but that does not diminish the interest in the inquiry or the skill with which it is carried out (although Beltrán spends too much time engaging with the secondary literature). However, the book is not especially well written, and there are a number of typographical errors and, more frustratingly, infelicities in the English (e.g., we're told that modes "inherit in God," when what is meant is "inhere in God") and a serious and confusing overuse of commas. For the price that the publisher Brill charges for this book, one would expect a better edited and more well-executed final product.

Steven Nadler, *University of Wisconsin–Madison*

God in the Enlightenment. William J. Bulman and Robert G. Ingram, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. xiv + 322 pp. $34.95.

William J. Bulman is an ambitious, coming historian. He advocates nothing less than a new "general framework" for a "balanced reconsideration of God in the Enlightenment" (4), an objective toward which, in fact, many scholars have been working for quite some time, not least Dale K. Van Kley, whose sparkling afterword has a different tempo to Bulman's no less acute but densely textured (some might say chewy) introductory essay. Bulman wants the Enlightenment to be decoupled from Spinoza (and from Jonathan Israel) and located more directly in relationship to the Reformation, to

become, it seems at times, almost a seventeenth-century phenomenon (though Bulman distances himself from any Hazardian rerun). It was born of an overriding recognition by states and ministers of the need to preserve civil peace, and for moderate, enlightened values to be less about toleration than to constitute a form of civil (and civilized) religion, preferably Christian in expression. And he is even brave enough to state what the Enlightenment was not, including radical in its early manifestations in the Dutch Republic, where disputes over biblical exegesis within confessions counted for more than philosophical rationalism outside them.

Bulman claims the chapters "offer crucial support" for the approach he outlines (21). They certainly go some way toward doing so. In a key essay, Brad S. Gregory demands a longer historical trajectory for Enlightenment discussion of the deity and sees in its conflation of God with his creation a confusion that had its origins in late medieval intellectual assumptions and the doctrinal disagreements of the Reformation. J. C. D. Clark agrees, in his paper on the divine attributes (of God the Father) and the question of categories, that the understanding of God's nature advanced by Deists from Herbert of Cherbury to Paine "had long been available" (215). In this latest attempt to dismantle the false teleologies and genealogies that prefigure the advent of secularity, Clark rather presumes the equation of civil society with majority Christian opinion in Britain. It could be an unsettling combination for the church(es). Justin Champion sets out Hobbes's defense of a civil religion, one that would preserve church institutions while achieving a "neutering of the divine" (43); Anton Matytsin argues for a shift in French apologetics of ca. 1730–60 toward defenses of the faith in response to perceived atheism that were based predominantly on natural rather than revealed theology and, as such, could be deemed supportive of civil society. The cost was high: the abandonment of efforts to prove the truth of Christianity. Clergy and laity were left to deal as best they could with providential uncertainty, the theme of Jonathan Sheehan's richly textured essay "Suffering Job," a figure turned, he plausibly contends, into "an historical everyman" (193) by Warburton and others. And this uncertainty was in itself likely to render precarious the consensual, civil religion increasingly endorsed. Paul Lin finds in the attempts by the French Protestant Souverain and the Anglican Stephen Nye to make Augustine a different sort of Trinitarian a good instance of that reinvention of primitive Christian faith that was in vogue ca. 1700. Such views, advanced in earnest, were both heterodox and subversive and were a thin foundation for civil equilibrium. Progressive Christian scholars like Richard Bentley sniffed them out in mainstream textual locations. Sarah Ellenzweig charts his underlying anxieties in his edition of *Paradise Lost* that Milton was a reader of materialist heterodoxy received via Spinoza.

By any standard, this is a fine collection of essays, anchored in the second half of the seventeenth century and also reflecting the global turn in Enlightenment studies, here represented in essays by Joan-Pau Rubiés on libertine readings of Hinduism and Claudia Brosseder making the case through the Jesuit Bernabé Cobo for the start of the

early Spanish American Enlightenment in Peru. Bulman admits to differences between the contributors, and candidly lays out the varying (arguably unreconcilable) perspectives and values of a Champion and a Gregory. Despite the grail of a new, consensual general framework that the editors want to construct, it is hard not to conclude that the best ticket remains what Bulman calls Van Kley's "ultimately pragmatist" (33) approach, one in which Enlightenment is at once unitary and pluralized.

Nigel Aston, *University of Leicester*

Identity, Intertextuality, and Performance in Early Modern Song Culture. Dieuwke van der Poel, Louis Peter Grijp, and Wim van Anrooij, eds. Intersections: Interdisciplinary Studies in Early Modern Culture 43. Leiden: Brill, 2016. xx + 378 pp. $181.

Songs are always interesting objects to study, because they involve text (often with a very particular structure), music (also with special features), and context (often quite elaborate). For this reason, most studies of songs restrict themselves to repertoires within a single cultural area—often a language area—and also within a certain historical period. The book under review here still adheres to a chronological demarcation, the early modern period, but it transgresses linguistic and cultural borders by including essays about song repertoires in the Low Countries, France, the German-speaking areas, the British Isles, and Scandinavia. And it is indeed surprising to see how many of the phenomena that one knows very well from the study of songs in one's own culture and history also happen to be of importance in the song cultures of other areas.

Identity, Intertextuality, and Performance contains fourteen essays by authors from seven countries. The essays discuss a great variety of subjects within the field of song culture: congregational singing, sacred songs of various denominations, songs found in *alba amicorum* and other manuscript sources, songs with a political or nationalist message, and so on. Some essays have to do with songs in private spaces, others with songs performed in public environments. The order of the essays is by area: first there are studies on sacred songs; then on secular songs of a private character, including love songs; and then songs for public occasions, including ballads and political songs. Most contributions deal with song repertoires from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century; two concentrate on the period from around 1800; one deals with early nineteenth-century songs, stretching the early modern period until 1848 in doing so. The title brings the expectation that these songs and their singing are approached with particular emphasis on identity, intertextuality, and performance, and this is indeed the case. These three key concepts, however, stand in different relations with songs or song repertoires: intertextuality is a property directly related to the textual content