catharsis and his writing vividly about his “gasping-gagging-gulping” and other persistent ailments.

Hawhee’s suggestive conclusion raps up her argument by focusing on Burke’s famous formulation of the motion/action opposition in the eighties. Not the least of Hawhee’s many accomplishments in Moving Bodies is her complication of this distinction, which she demonstrates is much more than a simple metaphysical opposition. Rather, the binary of nonsymbolic motion and symbolic action serves Burke as the basis of a “multidirectional theory” that, while positing an irreducible distinction between body and language, nonetheless shows the two terms to be parallel and complementary in the extreme (p. 166).

Again and again in Moving Bodies, Hawhee chronicles how Burke worked rhetorically through the body in different discursive fields. Burke thought literally about the body and its causal relation to language, and he thought figuratively with the body in his descriptions and explanations of cultural production and reception. Indeed, within Hawhee’s incisive rhetorical biography, the static/moving and functional/dysfunctional body emerges as the very condition of possibility for understanding Kenneth Burke as a theory-proving, symbol-using animal. Moving Bodies deserves praise not only for its full-bodied picture of Burke as language thinker but also for its proposal of an alternative materialist model for doing rhetorical history.

STEVEN MAILLOUX
Loyola Marymount University


Peter Mack sets himself an ambitious task in this short impressive book: to compare the ways Montaigne and Shakespeare composed essay and speech, respectively, following intellectual habits and practices acquired in their humanist grammar school education—and to explain why knowing this makes a difference. He begins by reviewing the reading and composition training of the schools—topical analysis from Agricola; culling of sentences, proverbs, and figures from Erasmus to furnish copious words and matter; learning the progymnasmata from Aphthonius to build complex verbal structures—then goes on to demonstrate how this training gave the writer a formal grammar by which to register the movements of a thinking mind. Thus an artificial method of reading and writing enabled the mimesis of natural human discourse. Mack adroitly showcases this insight through a close reading of De l’inconstance de nos actions, whose very theme signals Montaigne’s manner of stating a position–his own or his author’s–then responding defensively or critically with historical and poetic examples,
contemporary anecdotes, Latin verses, and personal reflections, each of which subtly modifies its predecessor. He is Montaigne still, but becomes much more legible as we recognize the tools he’s using to form his judgment.

When he cited other men’s words, Montaigne wrote, they were no longer theirs but his. In Chapter 2, “Montaigne’s Use of His Reading,” Mack shows in fine detail how Montaigne manipulates his sources to elaborate themes, strengthen them, and fashion oppositions that open them to fresh consideration. Sometimes he will wrest a line slyly from its context, as in Que philosopher c’est apprendre à mourir, where he quotes Ovid’s “When I die I would like it to be in the middle of my work” to reinforce the wish that death might come amidst ordinary toil; in Amores 2.10.36, the work is sexual. In De la vanité, he quotes Horace at length on exercising moderation so as to owe little to Fortune, then drains that stance of self-satisfaction by warning, “But watch out for the snag! Hundreds founder within the harbour.” More powerfully still, in Des coches he uses material from López de Gómara’s Histoire générale des Indes occidentales to turn its boastful message of conquest into a critique of European cruelty in the New World.

In Chapter 3, “Montaigne’s logic of fragment and sequence,” Mack walks us through the temporal accretions and logical structures of two early essays, Book I’s Des menteurs and Par diverse moyens on arrive a pareille fin, then focuses on the intellectual and emotional logic of a section of the longer De la vanité of Book III. Diagramming all three essays, he provides us with a synoptic view of a temporal reading process, which offers new cognitive pleasure, yet at the same time falsifies our normal reading experience, where ideas undulate successively before us and elude our grasp. Mack uses this discrepancy to make a useful point: Montaigne is never fully within our grasp, any more than he is ever fully in his own grasp. Reading the essays in fragments and sequences, however, mediates that difference in two important ways. Fragments often consist of “quotations, stories, fine phrases” (p. 61), which are connected by such logical topics as cause and consequence, contrary and complement, whole and part, greater and less, to form sequences. To follow the fragments of a sequence is to trace the logical movements of the writer’s mind and to approximate the way his contemporaries, products of the same education, are likely to have read him. We thereby gain access to an older mentalité.

Mack’s approach is less satisfactory when applied to Shakespeare’s dramatic speech. Chapter 4, “Logic and Narrative in Shakespeare and Montaigne,” opens with Shakespeare’s reading of North’s Plutarch in composing Coriolanus, and focuses on the final confrontation of the hero and his mother. While it is interesting to see how Shakespeare compresses and quotes Plutarch, it is disappointing to be told that Volumnia’s shift of addressee midway in her last speech, from Coriolanus to Virgilia and Young Martius—whom she exhorts to help persuade him not to attack Rome—is a move to the topic “circumstances” because they provide “context.” Though not incorrect, the implication that it is school logic and not the logic of the playwright’s spatial imagination at work here is misleading. Shakespeare composed visually as
well as textually. Claudius’ first speech in *Hamlet* also undergoes logical-rhetorical analysis without sufficient attention to the theatrical impact of the syntactical evasions that lie within its “though/yet/therefore” structure and obfuscat ing amplifications. One misses the links between logic, rhetoric, psychology, and theater. The method works better with soliloquies, which more closely resemble Montaigne’s essays—“O that this too, too sullied flesh would melt,” “O what a rogue and peasant slave am I”—for their function is to reveal a mind uttering itself, reflecting on what it hears, reacting against and correcting its own voice.

The latter part of the chapter probes the fascinating relationship of argument and narrative. At issue is the potential incongruity of a proposition and its supporting circumstances, by which it is often exceeded. In *Que le goust des biens et des maux dépend en bonne partie de l’opinion que nous en avons*, Montaigne tests the idea that our fear of death depends on opinion, not fact, by telling stories of people facing death with equanimity if not downright ribaldry. He then adds a story about Jews expelled from Spain, admitted to Portugal for a price, then ordered to leave or convert. The story ends with a description of mass suicide and infanticide in fidelity to religious belief, which so exceeds the tonal range of the evidence just presented that it moves the reader to reflect on the quite different issue of authoritarian cruelty—an effect less a function of intention than of copia itself.

Mack compares Montaigne’s use of such atrocity stories to Shakespeare’s, arguing that Shakespeare preferred to stage rather than narrate brutality in order to exploit its grisly visual power (exemplified by the murders of Rutland and York in *3Henry VI*), subsequently reinforced by narratives inciting revenge. This undervalues the complex interplay of action and word in Shakespeare, for these verbal accounts vary in both imagery and fact—the most egregious departure being Richard III’s when wooing Lady Anne—signaling rhetorical opportunism to an alert auditor. And often Shakespeare uses vivid speech to supplement or qualify what the stage cannot adequately show—witness Marcus’ encounter with the mutilated Lavinia in *Titus*, where his Ovidian imagery aestheticizes factual horror. As Montaigne manipulates complementary literary materials, so Shakespeare deploys both literary and visual materials. Given Mack’s theoretical focus here, it would have been illuminating to examine the relationship of visual “proposition” and literary “amplification” in the plays.

In the book’s ongoing dialectic between thesis and illustration Mack turns to his authors’ uses of history in Chapter 5. Montaigne seems to have treasured Plutarch more for his accounts of character than his relation of events. Shakespeare’s indebtedness to the English chroniclers and Plutarch was broader—plot episodes, character, language, and argument were lifted directly, developed from mere hints, or wholly refashioned. Mack has perceptive things to say about Shakespeare’s inventions. The domestic scenes, such as Hotspur and Kate’s, balance the “domesticity” of Hal’s tavern scenes, as the before-and-after encounters of Queen Margaret and the Yorkist queens balance each other, revealing the discursive work Shakespeare demanded of
his audiences. He was also more interested in practical politics than Montaigne, as registered in his careful representations of the rivalries and temporary alliances in the *Henry VI* and *Henry IV* plays, and later in the not wholly risible representation of the plebeians in *Coriolanus*, which he sets against the hero’s uncompromising denunciations of popular rule. Shakespeare’s larger interest in representing the nation leads Mack to focus on Falstaff as common man–appetitive, exploitative, cowardly, defiant, and comradely according to circumstances—the human embodiment of copia. For his part, the later Montaigne more soberly celebrates the sensual as well as the moral and intellectual Socrates: “(B) The most beautiful lives to my taste are those which conform to the common measure, (C) human and ordinate, without miracles though and (B) without rapture” (*De l’expérience*, quoted p. 135).

The final chapter, “Ethical issues in Montaigne and Shakespeare” is best described as Peter Mack’s commonplace book. Here he addresses such topics as Death, Revenge, Sex and Marriage, Fathers and Children, and compares Montaigne’s ruminations on these matters to Shakespeare’s. Even seasoned hands will be struck not only by the resemblance of the ideas voiced by the two writers but also by the similarly multiple perspectives each idea elicits, further proof that the grammar school habit of arguing in *utramque partem* was, as Jonson might say, “turned to blood.” Despite some local disappointments, Mack’s book achieves the end of all good scholarship and criticism: it makes us want to get back to Montaigne and Shakespeare with newly inquisitive eyes.

JOEL B. ALTMAN

*University of California, Berkeley*


Patricia Roberts-Miller’s *Fanatical Schemes* is a capacious study of proslavery thought in the south from 1835 through the coming of Civil War in 1861, though she sometimes glances backwards as far as the ancient world and forward to the Second World War and even occasionally the contemporary United States. It also deals with psychological theory and fiction. Thus, this expansive book covers a lot of time and intellectual ground. There are many lines of argument running through this wide-ranging volume; the primary thrust is how proslavery rhetoric – often expressed in oratory, though often in print – shaped the course our nation traveled toward Civil War. “The “tragedy of consensus” part of the subtitle is that proslavery rhetoric went too far and that led to the South’s extremism and ultimate downfall. Roberts-Miller presents one of the most comprehensive monographs in recent years