
Mais solidement appuyé sur les ouvrages les plus importants, et surtout sur les documents d'époque, l'ouvrage de M. J. Heath s'impose à l'attention par sa solide architecture; il suscite l'intérêt par la maestria de sa démonstration; il fait la preuve qu'un court ouvrage peut traiter de façon approfondie d'un vaste sujet.

PIERRE-LOUIS VAILLANCOURT, Université d'Ottawa


The Medieval & Renaissance texts & Studies series aims to publish “books that are needed,” and with the publication of this facsimile of John Ogilby’s Entertainment, a series of triumphal arches to celebrate the restoration of Charles II, they have hit the mark.

The first edition of the Entertainment, probably first sold on the day of the king's royal entry, 22 April 1661, provided a relatively brief description of the pageants built by London to honour the monarch. The second edition was much enlarged in format and in content by the addition of engravings by David Loggan and Wenceslaus Hollar, Elias Ashmole’s account of the coronation (an account censored, corrected, and approved by Sir Edward Walker, Garter King of Arms), and a host of references to the classical sources of Ogilby’s visual and verbal motifs. To make either of these editions more accessible would be a worthwhile enterprise, for the entertainment of Charles II marks both the end of a tradition of royal entries into London that can be traced back to 1393 and, through the representation of Charles as the new Augustus the inauguration of “what was to become an evaluative term for an entire period – the Augustan age” (p. 41). The second edition, as Ronald Knowles points out, does have special significance: “the most elaborate surviving document for any English festival” its “range of more than a hundred and thirty sources almost amounts to a compendium of seventeenth-century English neoclassicism” (p. 10).

This facsimile of the Entertainment is clear and complete, the volume sturdy and reasonably priced; that is, little of the magnificence of Ogilby’s original large folio remains. To my mind it is unfortunate that this facsimile reproduces the same copy
of the *Entertainment* (the Huntington Library's) already widely available on microfilm through University Microfilms of Ann Arbor, and it does so without any editorial apparatus in which lacunae in the copy might be filled. Reducing the original by about 35% does not adversely affect the text, but it does result in blurred or darkened features in the engravings; indeed, crucial details of the engraving of the first arch of triumph are more sharply delineated on the available microfilm than in this facsimile. But more important than the quality of the reproduction is the need for some discussion of the reasons for a facsimile of this particular work, rather than, let's say, a transcription on disk or on-line. A glance at the other accounts of English royal entries reveals the steady, increasing intrusion of classical lore upon accounts of such entertainments: references to Virgil appear infrequently and parenthetically in early Tudor texts; larger and more various, the citations of classical authorities fill the margins of Ben Jonson's masques and entertainments; and what were marginal in Jonson make up the body of Ogilby's text. The great occasion and the civic pageants produced to aggrandize it further are, paradoxically, dwarfed by the classical allusions in the printed texts, allusions which break up the record of the city's dramatic offering. Neither the art of the book nor the interplay of dramatic elements by which each pageant makes its meaning are of much interest to Ronald Knowles however.

What is of interest to Knowles is the "common literary tradition" that supplied royalist panegyrist and John Ogilby with a series of "concatenated themes" (p. 27). King Charles was hailed as Augustus, messiah, and lord of the seas, the last being a direct rejection of Dutch claims to maritime dominion. The time was celebrated as a phoenix period, as the start of the golden age (which to London's mercantile interests meant an age of more gold for them), and as the Platonic Great Year "when the sphere's are rowl'd / Back to the Loyal points they kept of old" (p. 27). Focusing on the verbal and pictorial topicality of the *Entertainment* triumphal arches, Knowles argues that "Ogilby's propaganda was a formulation of the discrete allusions of a year of tumultuous panegyric and related literature which repeatedly turned to Virgilian themes" (p. 22); indeed he goes further, claiming that the first pageant was "the most complete formation of a politically Augustan framework in the period" (p. 21). This analysis of Ogilby's use of panegyric *topoi* of the day could be criticized for being narrow, even at points inconsequential, were it not for what the analysis suggests about the habits of mind of Ogilby and his audience. "Reading" the pageantic structures required an appreciation of rhetorical amplification in visual and verbal terms, a recognition of "imagistic corollaries" (p. 40), and an awareness of the "double symmetry" of the design of the arches, which make their meanings through "the symbolic relationship between back and front, accentuated by the relationship of left to right" (p. 20). No wonder that the triumphal arches were intended to remain standing not just for the busy day of the royal entry, but for a year.

Besides this study of the rich allusiveness of the pageants, Knowles also provides a solid, traditional introduction to the *Entertainment*. He acknowledges the special-
ized studies of Ogilby’s life and work by other scholars and makes use of other kinds of documentary evidence of the royal entry, such as financial records and the opinions of contemporary diarists. He argues convincingly that the artificer “who desires to have his Name conceal’d” (p. 12) was Sir Balthazar Gerbier, through whom Rubens influenced Ogilby’s Entertainment. And Knowles sets the royal entry in its historical contexts, national, municipal, and personal. Although the change in government of the nation remains most important, the discussion of Charles’s readiness to re-schedule events, play traditional roles, and alter ceremonies so as to fulfill the prophecies made about him and his restoration is most interesting and most suggestive for the study of other English royal entries.

Careful and searching in his scholarship, Ronald Knowles is also forthright about his special angle on John Ogilby’s Entertainment. As a result, the introduction is as unpretentious as the facsimile, a clear reproduction of a clean copy of Ogilby’s work and a valuable addition to the MRTS series.

C. E. MCGEE, University of St. Jerome’s College


In the preface to Erasmus grandescens, Richard J. Schoeck states that the purpose of his book is “to consider Erasmus the man, as well as to study the humanist, the scholar and theologian, and to offer an interpretation which emphasizes the remarkable growth of Erasmus as a scholar and writer” (p. 10). This collection of essays does traverse all periods of Erasmus’ life and does strike a balance between Erasmus the private person and Erasmus the scholar, but as it is a collection of essays, Erasmus grandescens does not possess the continuity of a biography. Rather, the cogency of Erasmus grandescens lies in its elucidation of the major questions and controversies connected with Erasmus’ person and works.

In the first chapter, “The Place of Erasmus Today,” Professor Schoeck addresses the problems of the modern critic of Erasmus. He notes that “we have to mark Erasmus as a man whose work is today condemned to fragmentation, for we are compelled to read it in separated contexts and unrelated approaches; a man who becomes – as the burden of the past tends to harden inherited views and judgement of him by scholars whose sense of the whole of past tradition tends to diminish – a man who becomes, that is to say, progressively more difficult to understand” (p. 19). Schoeck encourages modern scholars to make an effort to comprehend the past and to become somewhat detached from their own age. He considers it the business of present-day humanists to transmit tradition, but warns that this transmission must be creative, for “living tradition is process, not product” (p. 27).