

*Dieu le bon usage des maladies*. Infused by the Psalms, the liturgy, and Pascal's reading of Augustine, Charles de Condren, and Saint-Cyran, the prayer moves, according to Sellier, from shadow to light, passing from humankind's suffering after the Fall to jubilation at God's consoling grace. Part 4, consisting of just two essays other than Sellier's reflection on his debt to Pascal, considers Racine's liturgical borrowings and Bossuet's Augustinianism. Although repetitive in places due to its nature as a compilation, Sellier's volume leaves readers with a deep appreciation for the way Port-Royal and its best-known author absorbed and innovated within the Christian tradition.

Joy Palacios, *University of Calgary*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2022.197

*Andreas Gryphius (1616–1664): Zwischen Tradition und Aufbruch*. Oliver Bach and Astrid Dröse, eds.

Frühe Neuzeit: Studien und Dokumente zur deutschen Literatur und Kultur im europäischen Kontext 231. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2020. viii + 645 pp. \$149.99.

---

In the 1960s and 1970s the work of Andreas Gryphius (1616–64) was included in anthologies such as Lowry Nelson Jr.'s *Baroque Lyric Poetry* (1961) and Frank J. Warnke's *Versions of Baroque* (1972) as a matter of course. Like much period talk, the Baroque with which he was associated at the time is seldom mentioned these days, even in Germany, where its use to celebrate the uptick of vernacular literature during Germany's more or less delayed Renaissance reached its high point during the golden age of Baroque studies during the 1920s and 1930s and continued up through the 1990s. In the present volume, the term *Baroque* does not occur as a major category of analysis. The shift is significant.

Based on a conference in Munich in the Gryphius jubilee year of 2016, this German-language volume contains an introduction and twenty-six essays that approach Gryphius's work "polyperspectively" (10), locating their principal in a broad network of political, ideological, legal, confessional, textual, and literary historical contexts. For example, Klaus Garber digs deeply into the vexed confessional context of Gryphius's home turf, the Thirty Years' War and postwar Silesia, where the Habsburg Empire re-Catholicized some of the smaller cities and principalities that were traditionally Lutheran in a ruthless manner. The Lutheran Gryphius was intimately involved in the strife as a leading politician in the Silesian city of Glogau. Nicola Kaminski's close reading of his text about an inferno that consumed the Silesian city Freystadt in 1637 shows how these conflicts played out both on the ground and in the text. Johann Anselm Steiger also sees Gryphius's spiritual poetry in this "specifically Silesian" context as substituting Christ for Mary as the "serpent destroyer" in a way that obliquely resists the imposition of the Catholic cult (113). Readings by Wilhelm

Kühlmann of Gryphius's odes together with Luther's Psalms; Dirk Niefanger of Gryphius's play, *Leo Arminius*, in conversation with the Strasburg Lutheran theologian Conrad Dannhauer's Christian hermeneutics; Friedrich Vollhardt of the impact of the Lutheran theologian Johann Arndt's work on Gryphius's religious lyric; and, from another perspective, Barbara Mahlmann-Bauer on the impact of the Jesuits in Silesia, likewise use meticulous close readings of the texts to embed questions of Gryphius's personal beliefs in the vexed conditions of the partisan theological debates of the times.

Other essays, while equally as detailed in their description of the theological and philosophical legal theories (Gideon Stiening) and gender codes (Mirosława Czarnecka and Oliver Bach, in a much more nuanced fashion) of the early modern period, zoom out, offering what Stiening calls a "critical history of ideas" (244). Gudrun Bamberg links Gryphius's work to and displays his knowledge of traditions from Cicero and Saint Augustine to Lipsius, Bodin, and Hobbes. Gryphius studied in Leiden and traveled to France and Italy, and thus knew the larger European political and literary landscape well; his play about the execution of Charles I in England in 1649, the subject of Constanze Baum's essay, is a case in point. Jörg Robert, Astrid Dröse, Marie-Therèse Mourny, and Achim Aurnhammer in turn demonstrate the implication of Gryphius's work in contemporary French and Italian discourses and genres via his active work as a translator (of Corneille, among others) as well as by intertextual reference in his generically diverse oeuvre. Dirk Werle's essay on Gryphius's *carmen heroicum* nevertheless makes it clear that there was an emerging local lineage of German-language textuality within which Gryphius was trying to position himself, which Thomas Borgstedt confirms. Gryphius thus emerges less as an author of a broadly defined Baroque period than as a poet-politician with his feet planted firmly on eastern Central European—Silesian—ground, who also moved about in a diverse textual world with great ease.

It is worth noting that almost all of the authors in this volume continue to debate, both in the essays themselves and in extremely lengthy footnotes, with a specifically German critical tradition about Gryphius dating back to the early twentieth century, when, as noted above, Baroque studies was in its heyday there. In these notes, readers are thus in effect introduced to a disciplinary history of the field in Germany over the past one hundred years. The continuing obligation to engage this tradition may explain why there are virtually no references to recent English-language work on Gryphius or on the seventeenth-century German tradition in the notes by James Parente, Bethany Wiggin, and Christopher Wild, among others, or by other established and rising scholars in Germany who have written on related issues (Daniel Weidner and Isabel von Holt). Baroque studies, at least as practiced by Warnke and Nelson back in the day, worked differently. Moreover, figures such as Carl Schmitt and Michel Foucault, whose ideas have been influential for studying the Renaissance and early modern period in other traditions, are mentioned here only very occasionally. The deeply informed

conversation taking place in Bach's and Dröse's volume will thus be valuable primarily for those working in Germany in what clearly continues to be a robust field.

Jane O. Newman, *University of California, Irvine*  
doi:10.1017/rqx.2022.198

*Ben Jonson and Posterity: Reception, Reputation, Legacy.* Martin Butler and Jane Rickard, eds.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. xv + 256 pp. \$99.99.

---

When confronted by intermittent failure during the course of his unusually successful literary career, Ben Jonson characteristically expressed confidence in the adulation of "posterity." Contemporary negative reactions to his work, he explained, would be canceled by this hypothetical community of future "understanders." What made Jonson's sense of posterity so peculiar, however, was his rejection of popularity as the source of legitimate reputation, since he assumed that the "multitude" (or majority) generally lacked critical judgment. It was for this reason that he was "content," he explained, quoting Horace, in the title-page epigraph of his 1616 *Works*, with reaching only a "few readers" ("Contentus paucis lectoribus"). If "posterity" is recognized in this restrictive manner, the admiration expressed by the eleven scholars behind this collection confirms Jonson's prediction. As long as his writing generates critical responses of this caliber, his legacy is assured.

Yet in fulfilling Jonson's criterion, the thoughtful and wide-ranging contributors to this collection paradoxically trace one of the most spectacular declines in popular reputation suffered by any English writer. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, Jonson was Britain's most celebrated poet. Today, aside from academic and theater enthusiasts, he is little known outside of *Volpone* and *The Alchemist* or the mythic sociable but surly versions of his persona in plays, novels, movies, advertisements, and cartoons that constitute what Martin Butler calls the stuff of "modern memory" (214). Part of the significance of this volume comes from its recognition of the difficulty of capturing a sense of Jonson's remarkable range of opinions, activities, and associations, as well as a sense of the wildly contradictory reactions to his work from the seventeenth century to the present. "Few writers have experienced such conflicting assessments" (2), Butler and Rickard observe.

Between an introduction by Butler and Rickard and an afterword by Julie Sanders, *Ben Jonson and Posterity* is divided into three parts: "Conceptualizing Jonson," "Jonson's Early Reception," and "Jonsonian Afterlives." The first part deals with three aspects of Jonson's career through essays by James Loxley, Adam Zucker, and Jean Howard that explore, respectively, issues of his popularity, pedantry, and corporeality. Loxley's essay reminds us of the crowds of well-wishers who greeted Jonson during his "foot voyage" to