range geographically from Britain, France, Italy and Germany to Scandinavia, the Low Countries, Poland, Spain and the Americas. Happily, the volume is concluded by two indexes of Names and Things, to allow the reader to search out cross-references as well as particular topics. This is a collection which testifies to the vitality, richness and authority of contemporary scholarship in the field.

JAMES McCONICA, *Oxford University*

Jennifer Brady and Wyman H. Herendeen, eds. *Jonson's 1616 Folio*. Dover: University of Delaware Press, 1991. Pp. 221.

J.R. Mulryne and Margaret Shewring, eds. *Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Pp. xiii, 271.

Both books consist of invited essays by differing contributors; at least one in each seems peripheral to the topic announced by the collection's title. In *Jonson's 1616 Folio*, Katherine Eisaman Maus's "Facts of the Matter: Satiric and Ideal Economies in the Jonsonian Imagination" does not relate Jonson's satire (mainly in the comedies) to its place in the 1616 Folio, so the editors would have been justified in replacing it, especially as in 1989 the paper had appeared in *English Literary Renaissance*. Joseph Loewenstein's "Printing and 'The Multitudinous Presse': The Contentious Texts of Jonson's Masques" has more to say about Jonson's differences with Samuel Daniel and his and Dekker's script for James I's 1604 entry into London than about his court masques from *Blackness* to *The Golden Age Restored*. The space the *Folio* gives the masques shows their importance to Jonson; they merit another essay to complement Loewenstein's.

To a non-expert on bibliography, Kevin J. Donovan's study of the 1616 Folio *qua* book is admirably clear. Wyman Herendeen's "A New Way to Pay Old Debts: Pretexts to the 1616 Folio" shows the significance of Jonson's separate dedications to each division of his book. A modern reader is likely to skip dedications and so overlook their importance not only in Jonson's Folio but in other Renaissance books. William Blissett's "Roman Ben Jonson" looks beyond the tragedies *Sejanus* and *Cataline* and their failure when first played to their link with the comical satire *Poetaster*, showing how Jonson's "Romanitas," informed by his reading of classical literature and history, deffered in different genres. Sara van den Berg's "Ben Jonson and the Ideology of Authorship" illustrates how, in the *Epigrams* and *The Forrest*, "Jonson consistently chooses as the occasion for poetry those moments that clarify the double location of authorship in the golden world of art and the brazen world of circumstance," to defend Jonson's habit of showing universals through the immediately contemporary. Stella P. Revard's "Classicism and Neo-Classicism" on the same poems re-examines Jonson's "overwhelming Roman debt" to Martial and Horace, then shows his less

recognized debt to their Renaissance Neo-Latin imitators. Jennifer Brady's concluding "'Noe fault, but Life': Jonson's Folio as Monument and Barrier" examines how Jonson's Folio prematurely made him a "classic" (hence dead) author and how, in the posthumous *Under-wood*, "the aging poet experienced his altered state" as "a mortifying spectacle" by lasting "long enough to witness a partial fragmentation of the *corpus* he had labored to construct" in the 1616 Folio.

J.R. Mulryne's introduction to *Theatre and Government under the Early Stuarts* declares,

The essays collected here [. . .] respond to [new historicist and cultural materialist approaches] in stressing political effect more than literary or theatrical 'quality,' in consciously extending the boundaries of the canon, in evaluating the cultural influence of censorship and control, in the leading attention given to previously marginal forms such as masque and civic pageantry, and in the manner in which, and the extent to which, historical evidence is assessed and deployed.

He considers some "disturbing" results from this approach to Shakespeare (especially in recent stage and film versions), then summarizes the work of scholars not represented in the volume, like Alexander Leggatt, and others, like Martin Butler, Julia Gasper, Margot Heinemann, and Graham Parry, contributors to it.

Simon Adams is the only historian contributor, perhaps invited to discuss political background for the remaining papers. Though he surveys early Stuart historiography for the past century, he never mentions theatricality as an instrument of Jacobean and Caroline government, indeed provides little more than a critical bibliography. Mulryne seems uncertain about this paper; after saying that Adams "alone among our contributors teaches in a department of history" he ignores his essay while commenting on all the rest. Katherine McLuskie's "Politics and Dramatic Form in Early Modern Tragedy," too brief for the range of its subject matter, is mainly on historical plays, mostly Elizabethan rather than Stuart. Julia Gasper's "Reformation Plays on the Public Stage" relates some of the same plays to their role in Jacobean church controversy. Margot Heinemann's "Drama and Opinion in the 1620s: Middleton and Massinger" supplements her discussion of Middleton in *Puritanism and Theatre* and adds more on Massinger, but barely names their frequent collaborator Fletcher, the King's Men's dramatist who surely had some say about content in plays he partly wrote, or "dressed" before performance.

The core articles of this collection are those concerned with censorship and "the marginal forms" of masque and civic pageantry. Richard Dutton's "Ben Jonson and the Master of the Revels" examines the censorship activities of the Masters Jonson lived under—Tilney, Buc, Astley, and Herbert—and how he confronted them. Graham Parry's "Politics of the Jacobean Masque" and Martin Butler's "Reform or Reverence? The Politics of the Caroline Masque" relate the position of masque writers to the changing political environment. Parry's shows how opposition between James's

(and Queen Anne's) foreign policy and Prince Henry's was almost overt in the masques of 1609-1613, while Butler's shows how the Caroline masque "inculcate[d] respect for the programme and achievements of Charles's government," yet built "bridges to the king's critics (some of whom might have been dancing in the masque)." James Knowles's "The Spectacle of the Realm: Civic Consciousness, Rhetoric and Ritual in Early Modern London" examines urban spectacles as analogues and debtors to the court masque, having similar purposes but for different ends.

Essay collections like these two can bring their readers a greater variety of information and points of view than could a set of monographs on the same subjects. Their quality depends on the quality of each contributor's submission, and when essays are, like these, invited, editors can be hostages to their contributors, since to refuse a paper or demand extensive rewriting is almost impossible, especially with an approaching (or past) deadline. These collections contain much of value, but greater editorial toughness, in some instances, would have bettered both.

JEAN MacINTYRE, *University of Alberta*