of Sidney’s revisions that implicates his evangelical convictions so thoroughly. The evidence the book adduces is never less than suggestive, and the sheer weight of this evidence should incline the balance in the argument’s favour. Whether the reader finds it persuasive will depend in part on the reader’s assessment of the book’s claims about *Arcadia’s* adoption of an evangelical allegorical method. While the book roots this approach to interpretation in Luther, it is worth noting that Sidney’s evangelical commitments appear to have been more Reformed, and Calvin’s understanding of and interest in Revelation is somewhat different from Luther’s. If the significance of this method to *Arcadia* is granted, then it is worth noting further that its emphasis on the importance of narrative patterns of images and topoi can sometimes produce a Robertsonian effect, particularly in moments when specific correspondences seem tenuous. Finally, as Brumbaugh is fully aware, the notion of *Arcadia* as a biblical allegory must confront longstanding critical inertia in the study of Sidney’s writing which has been reluctant to accord Sidney’s evangelical commitments a place in his literary production. How the field will respond to this reading I am unsure, but scholars of early modern literature and religion should welcome the intervention.

**Dan Breen**

Ithaca College

**Chapman, George.**

*Homer’s Iliad.* Ed. Robert S. Miola.


The publication and circulation of Greek texts during the European Renaissance was more extensive and influential than has previously been supposed. In England, for example, texts from ancient Greece were taken up widely in grammar schools and universities but also via the commercial theatre, as Tania Demetriou and Tanya Pollard have recently shown. The English playwright George Chapman was a key figure in this development, for his verse translations of Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Robert S. Miola points out, “contributed
significantly to the larger European humanist recovery of the classics” while simultaneously “participating in the creation of a native national literature” (1).

Miola’s edition of Chapman’s *Iliad* serves as a companion volume to Chapman’s translation of the *Odyssey* edited by Gordan Kendal, also for the Modern Humanities Research Association’s Tudor and Stuart Translations series, under the general editorship of Andrew Hadfield and Neil Rhodes. Each series volume presents an influential text’s translation, newly edited with notes, glossaries, and a critical introduction. Extending and updating the Tudor Translations series published in the early twentieth century, the new MHRA series includes texts published after James I’s accession in 1603. Chapman had published translated segments of Homer as early as 1598, and in 1609 his first twelve books of the *Iliad* appeared in print, but it was 1611 before his translation of all twenty-four books was published, and 1616 before a revised version of his translated *Iliad* appeared together with his complete translation of Homer’s *Odyssey*. Miola uses as his copytext the first full publication of Chapman’s *The Iliads of Homer, Prince of Poets* (London, 1611; STC 13634). Recording important variants in textual notes, he also helpfully discusses Chapman’s revision process.

Over nearly two decades, Miola argues, Chapman’s persistence in seeking to render Homer’s Greek text with fidelity resulted in increasingly bold experimentation with metrical form. Providing close readings of key examples from parallel passages, Miola persuasively maps a shift from “the eight-and-six jog-trot of the early heptameter” (4) to a metrical line encompassing varied rhythmic accents. Chapman’s linguistic experimentation is also noteworthy. Supplementing and correcting the *Oxford English Dictionary Online*, Miola provides an appendix of “Neologisms and Contributions to the English Language” containing several hundred words and phrases from the 1611 *Iliad* that were coined, or deployed in a new sense, by Chapman. Many of these items rely on the addition of prefixes or suffixes—for example, “‘immartial’ 7.206, unwarlike” and “‘amazeful’ 17.658, distracted” (3). Chapman also joins words together to create new compounds, one example being “‘dog-giv’n’ (11.256, addicted to dogs)” (3). Chapman also coins “elaborate compound epithets,” describing Nestor’s speech in book 1, for example, as “‘more-than-honey-sweet discourse’ (1.2457)” (3). Other new words—such as “asinine,” “garrulous,” and “vociferous”—remain in common usage (2). Such innovations, together with Chapman’s willingness to push words past their received meanings, allow his verse to vividly convey physicality, sensation, and affect, as well as
more abstract philosophizing. By 1611, Miola shows, Chapman’s efforts as a translator had already resulted in the “flexible, expansive, and powerful epic style” (5) of which John Keats writes so appreciatively in his “On First Looking into Chapman’s Homer.”

Miola clearly shares Keats’s appreciation for Chapman as a poet-translator. Yet he also points out how Chapman’s refashioning of Homer at times misinterprets specific words and phrases, and substitutes a post-classical, early modern Christian ethos for the warrior codes—and unknowable, unjust gods—of Homer’s pagan universe. With this balanced approach to its subject matter, Miola’s edition shines a light not only on Homer but also on the early modern worldview that informs Chapman’s translation choices as well as his prefaces, marginalia, and commentary.

Following Miola’s substantial Introduction, the volume reproduces Chapman’s “To the Reader,” “The Preface of the Reader,” and “Of Homer,” followed by Chapman’s translation of the Homeric text, Miola’s glosses, and longer annotations at the margins and footnotes respectively, and Chapman’s own arguments to the various books together with his own marginalia and commentary. Throughout, Miola modernizes early modern spelling, with the aim of accessibility and consistency. He also provides textual notes, a glossary of names and places, the appendix listing neologisms noted above, a brief bibliography of further reading, and an index to his Introduction and notes. Initially, I found it difficult to determine exactly which commentary and marginalia were Chapman’s, versus which were Miola’s. The short but clear “Note on Editorial Procedures” together with explanatory comments in the Introduction, however, helped me to navigate through my initial confusion, while the physical size of the printed volume (I was not able to consult an online copy) also made for an easy read, each page containing room for the poetic text, marginal glosses, footnotes, and running headers, all with significant margins.

This expertly edited volume, suitable for scholars, students, and general readers alike, significantly expands what we know about the cultural transmission of classical texts in early modern Europe. Presenting new insights regarding the reception and dissemination of Homeric epic in early modern England, it also helpfully illuminates Chapman’s specific contributions as versifier, wordsmith, and critic.

MELINDA J. GOUGH
McMaster University