Christopher M. Armitage, *Sir Walter Raleigh, an Annotated Bibliography*, Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1987. Pp. xiv, 236, and John R. Roberts, *George Herbert, An Annotated Bibliography of Modern Criticism, 1905–1984*, revised edition. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1988. Pp. xx, 486.

Bibliographies of secondary sources have presumably several purposes, not the least of which is enabling readers to trace the development of reputation and consequent critical approaches to their subjects. In these two bibliographies—of the bold bad Raleigh and the saintly Herbert—very different, almost antithetical, strategies have been used to interesting effect, justified by the authors, and presented for the use of scholars in different fields of study.

Roberts's bibliography of Herbert studies seems the more satisfying to me, with its modest claims and impressive achievement seeming to reflect the image of Herbert himself. Essentially all Roberts gives us is a list by years of all studies of any kind between 1905 and 1984, the time within which Herbert ceased to be a poet for antiquaries and became the great poet we now recognize. There are an imposing 1453 items in the total list, which excludes—justifiably. I think—unpublished doctoral theses and some works not written in English and ranges from a slight three items in 1905 to a full forty in 1984. The annotations are both excellent and blessedly full, giving the reader a summary of the main points and approaches in each item and, I suppose, unspoken hints about what to seek out to read and what to ignore. They also trace the relationships between articles, allowing the reader to see who has responded to whom about what, and to follow the main critical arguments about Herbert through our century. Reviews are not abstracted, except where they are particularly significant, but they are all listed under the book titles. The alphabetical sequence within years is doubtless the most sensible arrangement in a book of this kind, though it is a bit startling to find that item 1 in the bibliography is a review of item 2. And in fact everything is easily found in the three indexes, of authors, subjects, and works of Herbert discussed. Roberts does guide his readers to everything that has been done in Herbert scholarship in this century and, as I suggested, in Herbert's own manner, modestly offering a masterly accomplishment.

Armitage seems to take his tone from his subject as well, producing a bibliography of writings by and about Raleigh between 1576 and 1986 that is at times as swashbuckling and confusing as his subject's 'The Ocean to Cynthia', a poem I had trouble tracking down to its first publication at item 108, not indexed. There are 1967 items in all. Unlike Roberts, Armitage includes doctoral theses, but gives us an appalling list of things 'intentionally omitted': Raleigh's manuscripts, for which we are referred to Beal's *Index of English Literary Manuscripts*, which apparently documents 842 of them; bibliographical descriptions of books before 1700; selections in textbooks, which is odd since children's books about Raleigh are included;

reviews of books about Raleigh that have not been reprinted in essay collections are left out, as are publications in 'relatively inaccessible places'. So Armitage tells us that William Carlos Williams's prose poem on the hero 'first appeared in the short-lived periodical *Broom*, then was reprinted in his book *In the American Grain*', and calmly adds that only the second publication has been considered worth listing. Well, why? How many other publications have been treated the same way? Surely one reads a bibliography to get as complete an account as possible of what was written by and about an author, to get the information by which to make informed critical judgements.

Roundly ignored are the two short-title catalogues that most scholars of Renaissance English automatically reach for when thinking about early publications. Neither Pollard and Redgrave, corrected by Ferguson and Jackson and finished so well by Katharine Pantzer, nor the less certain Wing STC to 1700 gets so much as a notice. So we have no idea where Armitage is getting his information from, whether he is even aware of the vast amount of knowledge presented by the STC bibliographers, what kinds of books Raleigh's were in format or reliability, or what reading publics they were printed for, how many copies have survived and where they are, what textual states they represent through cancellation or form correction, or where they can be found in the University Microfilm series.

Examples of this approach abound throughout the whole book, as for example in entry 38, the first edition of *The History of the World*. There is no STC number, no reference to available copies, no information about the state of the text; the book is said to have been licensed by the Stationer's Company on 15 April, without any reference to Arber, much less the original Hall Book; the book is said to have been suppressed by King James, without any explanation, through an order signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury on 22 December 1614, with no referent to the source of the information; and the book is said to have an allegorical frontispiece, which is neither pictured nor explained. The reader could well ask what bibliographical information he has had for his trouble and expense, where all this comes from, why the book was three years between entry and publication, how it finally did get published, and more, on all of which Armitage is silent.

The finding of stuff in the bibliography is not at all facilitated by the curious arrangement of entries into seven sections: works by or attributed to Raleigh; biography; Raleigh in Europe, England, and Ireland; Raleigh in America; literary history and criticism; literature, music, the visual arts and children's books; and finally bibliography, still wanting the vital STC's. The first section is in title sequence of a sort; the rest are alphabetical by author. All this is held together by a solitary index of 'authors and selected topics'. It just won't do. Having to read through a whole section that includes a whole heap of anthologies to find out anything about 'The Ocean of Cynthia'—and precious little about it at that—is not compensated for by learning that Shakespeare's *Love's Labours Lost* is a play in which Raleigh and his circle of friends 'may be satirised' (1904) or that two nice

ladies included him in *Those Who Dared: Stories of Early Days in Our Country* (1951) or that Matthew Arnold made a disparaging comparison between Raleigh and Thucydides (1847).

Much that the reader of a bibliography wants to know is simply left out this book; a great deal that seems quite unnecessary is included; the indexing is little help; anyone wishing to use it will be driven to STC, Wing, and Beal, while the omissions compel the reader to doubt the information that is given.

As Armitage gives us less than we expect, Roberts gives us more, presenting a kind of object lesson to bibliographers.

E.J. DEVEREUX, *University of Western Ontario*

Sara Heller Mendelson. *The Mental World of Stuart Women. Three Studies*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1987. Pp. 235.

In spite of the growth of feminist scholarship in the last decade, seventeenth century literature remains an almost exclusively male preserve. The few women writers who are beginning to be included in the standard anthologies remain exceptional figures, noted for personal peculiarities uncharacteristic of their sex. It is precisely because literary women are so unique in this era that any publication which attempts to penetrate the dark obscurity of their creative sources and identify a commonality in their experiences is a welcome resource.

In the introduction to her book, Sara Mendelson attempts to sort out some of the peculiarities of women's roles and status during the seventeenth century. She finds that women are a subdued groups, mostly illiterate, while those who could write and dared to challenge the masculine dominion over writing most often chose religious subjects. For the most part, women were divided on class lines rather than those of gender, although "gender entailed certain common experiences which transcended class differences" (6). Not surprisingly, female culture was ultimately defined, then as now, in terms of its otherness. It represented the "non-literate obverse of literate male culture, almost as if women sought to compensate for their lack of literate skills through other modes of expression" (7). Some of these modes common to women of all ranks and classes were the knowledge of housewifery, child-bearing and rearing, as well as needlework and textile crafts (8). Women were also allowed to dabble as amateurs in medicine, music and piety. Thus, although there was a certain shared culture based on gender, there was no identifiable source within that female world to account for the literary aspirations of seventeenth-century women.

Mendelson does not provide a sufficient transition from the discussion of female culture in her introduction to the detailed biographies in the rest of the volume. Indeed, she admits to what can be regarded as a major flaw in the work, namely,