

(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2019), which traces the creation, dissemination, and consumption of handwritten recipe collections in early modern households.

Jenny Boulboulé

---

**Dirk van Miert**, *The Emancipation of Biblical Philology in the Dutch Republic, 1590–1670*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. Pp. 320. US\$110.00 (cloth).

This well-researched book is one of several studies on biblical philology that have appeared with Oxford University Press over the past few years; others are Nicholas Hardy, *Criticism and Confession: The Bible in the Seventeenth Century Republic of Letters* (2017); Dirk van Miert, Henk Nellen, Piet Steenbakkens, and Jetze Touber, eds., *Scriptural Authority and Biblical Criticism in the Dutch Golden Age: God's Word Questioned* (2017); and Jetze Touber, *Spinoza and Biblical Philology in the Dutch Republic (1660–1710)* (2018).

The focus of van Miert's book is the emancipation of biblical philology in the Dutch Republic in the seventeenth century, with a key role for Joseph Scaliger (1540–1609) as the founding father of this type of philology. Biblical philology is defined in several places as textual criticism, linguistic analysis, and historical contextualization of the biblical text. Van Miert argues that biblical philology was practiced by scholars from widely different factions within the church and that it was not the domain of more liberal or progressive thinkers as opposed to orthodox or traditional ones. Another recurring theme in the book is the role of publication context for a scholar's freedom to express his views on biblical philology.

In the introduction, van Miert gives an overview of the history of biblical philology from antiquity up to the days of Scaliger, the subject of the first chapter. He then raises the central question of the book: how did Scaliger's philology influence biblical scholars in the Dutch Republic up to the time of Spinoza? The chapters that follow are organized chronologically around case studies of biblical scholars from the Dutch Republic.

The first chapter describes the biblical philology of Scaliger himself, based on published and unpublished works by that author. The publication context is relevant: van Miert's analysis reveals that Scaliger was more guarded when he knew his writings would be widely read and that he asked his correspondents for confidentiality when sharing his more controversial thoughts in private. The chapter provides an interesting problematization of the private and the public sphere for authors in this period.

In order to illustrate that biblical philology was practiced by scholars from different factions within the Reformed Orthodox Church, chapter 2 explores the biblical philology of Jacobus Arminius (1560–1609) and Franciscus Gomarus (1561–1641). Although Scaliger is often associated with Arminianism, van Miert argues that, in terms of biblical philology, he actually had more in common with Gomarus. Chapter 3, on the Dutch States Translation (*Statenvertaling*), makes a similar argument: that biblical philology was practiced by the scholars responsible for the States Translation implies that it was not controversial. Chapter 4 focuses on Scaliger's student Daniel Heinsius (1580–1655), particularly his *Aristarchus sacer* and *Sacrae exercitationes*. Like the cases discussed in the previous two chapters, Heinsius's case shows that biblical philology was not a matter of "orthodox" versus "radical."

The next two chapters illustrate what happens when biblical philology meets politics and public debates. Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), another famous student of Scaliger's, is the subject of chapter 5. Using Grotius's *Annotationes* as a source, van Miert argues that Grotius used Scaliger's heritage for his political ends—to promote the ecumene of Protestants and Catholics—and that this ideological motivation diminished the quality of Grotius's scholarship. Chapter 6 discusses the Hairy War (*Harige Oorlog*); the debate on long hair on men, and in some cases women, that was carried on in the Dutch Republic in the seventeenth century. Van Miert uses this debate as a backdrop for the biblical philology of Claude Saumaise (1588–1653), focusing on two of Saumaise's writings on the issue of long hair. This debate made biblical philology relevant for the public behavior of common people.

Like chapter 1, chapter 7, on Isaac de La Peyrère (1596–1676), problematizes the publication context of biblical philology: La Peyrère could share his ideas only within certain limits. Some of the most interesting observations of the chapter are presented in the conclusions: the idea of the author's double persona, or even a double truth, a private and a public one.

Finally, chapter 8 discusses cases of biblical philology "on the eve of Spinoza," that is, the middle of the seventeenth century. Together with the preceding chapters, it demonstrates that when Spinoza appeared on the scene, biblical philology had already established itself. Its emancipation had taken place in multiple areas: biblical philology had moved from individual research projects to the academic curriculum; from private discussions to public debates; from Latin to the vernacular languages; and from the elite to the general public.

Readers interested in the history of the humanities will find this book rich in detailed discussions of the sources, including unpublished ones, and the problematization of their publication context. It gives many concrete examples of philological questions and arguments. However, it requires some background knowledge of the period, authors, and

ideas. Furthermore, for readers unfamiliar with existing scholarship on this topic, it may be difficult to situate Van Miert's book and to evaluate its originality and relevance, since the author engages with earlier literature mainly on specific questions, without positioning himself in a broader debate. Specifically, whereas other recent books on biblical philology in the early modern period have problematized the importance of philology for the history of the humanities and in relation to the history of science, Van Miert's study only touches on these questions. This book will therefore appeal more to readers looking for specialized information on biblical philology in the Dutch Republic than to those interested in a broader narrative on the history of the humanities.

Annet den Haan

---

**Astrid Alexander Bakkerus, Rebeca Fernández Rodríguez, Liesbeth Zack, and Otto Zwartjes**, eds., *Missionary Linguistic Studies from Mesoamerica to Patagonia*. Brill's Studies in Language, Cognition and Culture 22. Leiden: Brill, 2020. Pp. 312. €119.00.

The field known for several decades as "missionary linguistics" is a very diverse one. Its backbone consists of early modern, and sometimes modern, language-related sources that we owe to missionaries (missionary linguistics in the narrow sense) or other travelers (such as merchants, explorers, soldiers—missionary linguistics in the broad sense). These often contain very precious information about otherwise poorly documented "exotic" languages. However, the ways in which scholars approach these sources vary widely. Indeed, the missionary texts can be studied both from the perspective of historical linguistics and from the perspective of the history of linguistics (to leave aside for a moment other approaches, such as postcolonial ones). In the first approach, where scholars regard the early modern sources first and foremost as documentary sources from which linguistic data can be extracted, attention to the historical creators of these sources tends to remain very limited. As actors, the missionaries appear much more prominently in the second approach, where historiographers dwell on the motivations and methods of the missionaries in recording ancient languages. Only the latter approach is relevant to the target audience of this journal, even though the distinction is gradual rather than binary in nature.

Given that the volume under review was published against the backdrop of the tenth anniversary of the creation of the Amsterdam research group Revitalizing Older Linguistic Documentation (ROLD), it comes as no surprise that some of the contributions incline more toward the first approach. This applies, for example, to two contributions on