excellent use of a vast range of manuscript sources – government documents, minutes of meetings, ambassadors' reports, letters – from archives in Florence, Milan, Ferrara, Mantua, Modena, Pisa, Venice, Rome, Paris, and London. Such extensive and thorough archival work is evident in the high quality of the research and the precision of the scholarship that imbues not only the narrative, but the notes as well. One is left to wait eagerly for Professor Clarke's next in-depth study.

KONRAD EISENBICHLER, *University of Toronto*

Medieval & Renaissance Drama, V, edited by Leeds Barroll and James Shapiro. New York: AMS Press, 1991. Pp. xiv, 461.

This series, which invites articles of a length appropriate "to the task at hand" on any topic concerning English drama before 1642, does not attempt to pursue a single theme in each volume. Obviously this volume's sixteen articles, one review article, and eighteen reviews focus on English literature, but some show multidisciplinary interests, particularly in connection with historical, political, and social concerns. In "*Respublica: Rituals of Social Elevation and the Political Mythology of Mary Tudor*," Douglas F. Routledge analyzes the play's structure in the light of anthropological theory to reveal its political purpose of portraying Mary as the restorer of order after a period of festive inversion and misrule. Theodora A. Jankowski is also interested in social and political perceptions of a Tudor Queen, but finds that Lyly failed in his purpose of flattering Elizabeth in *Sapho and Phao* because he lacked "a coherent discourse of female rule" (p. 75) to draw upon, and instead attempted unsuccessfully to employ "the romance's language of female flattery" (p. 81). At the end of the sixteenth century, *Sir John Oldcastle* appears to Larry S. Champion to reveal new approaches to historical inquiry, in that it seems to allow a double perception of historical events, one of which ratifies the aristocratic status quo and one which questions and subverts it.

Economic history is part of the subject of two articles. Roslyn L. Knutson offers a reinterpretation of the significance of Henslowe's records of partial payments for playtexts, arguing that they show the Admiral's men seeking to exploit the commercial opportunities arising from the establishment of the Chamberlain's Men across the road, rather than taking desperate measures to cope with the new competition. Similarly S. P. Cerasano reinterprets the economic facts of Henslowe's and Alleyn's *Mastership of the Bears*, demonstrating that the post was lucrative and prestigious, and that bearbaiting was both exciting and attractive in itself, and associated with other specularly entertaining and "artistic" effects.

Alan Somerset and C. E. McGee, both editors of volumes in the REED series, offer substantial articles based on fresh documentary evidence. Through an analysis

of documentation relating to a dispute over a maypole in Shrewsbury in 1591, Somerset cautions that new historicist and cultural materialist interpretations of folk history and festival may be misled by the rhetoric of participants' reports into seeing subversion and containment, rather than as in this case "a dispute among the various privileged factions" (p. 254) of the city. McGee provides more than 20 pages of transcripts from the diary of William Whiteway, merchant of Dorchester, and from the records of the City of London and the Merchant Taylors', as appendices to his demonstration of the political and economic motivations behind the City of London's financing of a second performance in the Merchant Taylors' Hall of Shirley's masque *The Triumph of Peace* recently performed at Court.

Lila Geller turns to theology and to religious controversy to support a new reading of Middleton's *More Dissemblers Besides Women* (1615). According to her interpretation of Protestant as opposed to Catholic views on vows (especially rash or impossible vows), and on matrimony, critics have been wrong to believe that Middleton was condemning the central character, the Duchess, for not keeping the vow of chastity she made to her dying husband: the play "does not tragically bemoan the inability of its characters to keep to lofty standards of self-denial, but rather exposes hypocrisy to ridicule and the frailty of self-deception to laughter" (p. 306).

The articles by G. B. Shand, Albert H. Tricomi, and Stephen K. Wright treat medieval rather than Renaissance drama, though the first two (on the Anglo-Normand *Ordo Repraesentationis Adae* or *Adam*, and on comic experience in the English Cycle plays) draw comparisons with Shakespeare, and the third speculates in the light of continental analogues on the contents of the lost York Creed play, which was still performed well into the sixteenth century. The other articles are more exclusively concerned with English literary studies: James R. Siemon offers a Bakhtinian approach to *The Spanish Tragedy* and William W. E. Slights an essay on "Bodies of Text and Textualized Bodies in *Sejanus* and *Coriolanus*;" Glenn A. Steinberg examines plot and improvisation in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*; Peter M. Wright studies Jonson's stage directions in his 1616 *Workes* and Leslie Thomson surveys the evidence for actual and fictional windows in the staging of Renaissance plays. David Scott Kastan's review article "Demanding History" affords him the opportunity to heap scorn on Allan Bloom, Lynne Cheney and William Bennett, and to eulogize Walter Cohen, Jonathan Dollimore, Alan Sinfield, and Stephen Greenblatt.

There are some reviews of books whose subjects extend beyond the discipline of English: Coppélia Kahn writes on Martin Ingram's *Church Courts, Sex and Marriage in England, 1570–1640*, and O. B. Hardison, Jr. reviews *The Apocalypse in English Renaissance Thought and Literature*, edited by C. A. Patrides and Joseph Wittreich. Perhaps mention should be made of Lawrence M. Clopper's review of Steven E. Hart and Margaret M. Knapp's "*The Aunchant and Famous Cittie:*" *David Rogers and the Chester Mystery Plays:*" after a temperate but detailed

exposition of the book's shortcomings he reveals that he had read the typescript and had not recommended publication; he then declares that he wishes to dissociate himself from the book, and questions how it came to be published (apparently in a shoddy but expensive format).

Medieval and Renaissance Drama in England is a handsome volume, but is not without misprints which begin in the listing of the Editorial Board and can be found in running titles as well as scattered through the text. Most saddening to me is the repeated "elegaic" (p. 100); most cheering are the "British cultured materialists" on p. 245 (colonial deference?), and the pleasing concept of Cohen's "eclectic Marxism" on p. 351.

JUDITH M. KENNEDY, *St. Thomas University*

Sebastian De Grazia. *Machiavelli in Hell*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989. Pp. 497.

First a word about the title. The Hell in which De Grazia places Machiavelli is not the Dantean or the traditional pulpit hell, but rather a place in the afterworld where makers of states gather. Membership in this club is reserved for those who founded states either through their deeds (princes) or their writing (authors). The last category includes famous political theorists, such as Aristotle, Plato and, of course, Machiavelli. The fresh conception of Hell, which is actually a corner of paradise or simply the "dwelling place of heroes" (p. 385), proceeds from a moral philosophy whereby the new political leader, the "prince new" or the founder of states (and implicitly, his counselor/tutor) is indeed the savior, the redeemer of a fallen or corrupt principality. In carrying out this redemption or in founding a new state, the prince at times is "necessitated to enter evil:" if necessary he must kill even his own sons, and he would do so for love of his country, which supposedly he loves more than his soul (p. 352). But in so doing, the prince risks eternal damnation, for "entering into evil" means to sin. Here, De Grazia draws a pivotal distinction between sin and sinner, act and actor, deeds and doer. His point is predicated on the semantic difference between cruelty and cruelties: the first is an intrinsic trait of a wicked individual, the latter is an act which a person (a prince) is often "necessitated" to commit or perform, even though he is not cruel by nature. But unless one accepts Isaac Berlin's suggestion that Machiavelli places the prince with a pagan or Greco-Roman morality, the dilemma still remains, for in Judeo-Christian conventions a sin is a sin, whether committed by sheer cruelty or by necessity of state. De Grazia resolves the issue by arguing that in Machiavelli's view God was favorably predisposed toward political leaders who sinned for the good of the state. The strength of the argument is primarily derived from Chapter XXVI of *The*