event of royal misbehaviour is set beside the new Henry V's moving renunciation of his former wildness (66-67).

Part of the problem might lie in the design of the series. In this volume, "context" - the long quotations from various works of contemporary with Shakespeare - outweighs "commentary" - the author's explanations of the relationships between texts - by about three or four to one. As a consequence, it is impossible for the author to formulate any kind of sustained argument or exposition. The text is distressingly uneven, transitions are either abrupt or non-existent, and chapter-conclusions seem to come out of nowhere.

The Shakespeare evoked in this book is too wishy-washy to be in any way engaging. Henry V, for example, is neither a tyrant nor a Christian king (or perhaps not): "Must we then assume that Shakespeare is writing with sustained and bitter irony in his portrayal of Henry....The answer is probably no: the overall tone of the play does not support such a view. What is clear, however, from a study of the historical context in which plays like *Henry V* were written is the complexity of Shakespeare's response to political questions. Above all he is a relentless critic of sentimental self-deception. *Henry V* contains some wonderfully stirring rhetoric; but the play does not allow us to forget the cruel and sometimes futile realities of war" (77). Here either the author must make up his mind between the two conventional views of Shakespeare's Henry V or he must try to explain what artistic and political conditions compelled Shakespeare to be so Janus-faced in his depiction of Henry V.

On the whole, the Shakespeare who emerges from this book seems unexcited about politics. He is neither conservative nor radical, neither royalist nor republican; we are told - correctly - that he is not a political propagandist, that "he is interested in human beings caught up in the drama of power" (61), that he "avoided controversy" (126), and that the manner of his handling of political questions is "typically oblique and elusive" (160). A man such as this is likely to have fallen into a doze at the deposition-trial of Richard II. Instructors desirous of their students' engagement with the "political" Shakespeare would be better off with a livelier book.

PAUL YACHNIN, *Wilfrid Laurier University*

Collected Works of Erasmus Volume 27 & 28, Literary and Educational Writings 5 & 6, ed. A. H. T. Levi. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1986.

These two volumes of the *Collected Works of Erasmus* contain the most important and widely-read of the great humanist's satires, with clear and accurate English translations based on the most recent textual studies, and generally excellent introductions. As with any composite work, there are problems for the reader, who must do a great deal of flipping back and forth to understand it all, but the general

editor, A. H. T. Levi, does provide a superb introduction linking the books and satires and explaining what satire would have meant to Erasmus.

While it is easy for us to see *The Praise of Folly* as satiric, works like the lengthy and turgid *Panegyric for Archduke Philip* seem considerably less so. But Professor Levi argues that satire in the sixteenth century did not imply irony or humour, drawing on contemporary French sources, he tells us that the word "came to cover the whole range of comment on values and behaviour, from a tentative exploration of possible way of organizing society to the depiction of an ideal prince, and from an attack on war or on flattery to the most robust forms of private invective." I am not sure this is totally convincing. When Sir Philip Sidney wrote of satire that it "sportingly never leaveth until he make a man laugh at folly, and at length ashamed to laugh at himself, which he cannot avoid, without avoiding the folly," he obviously expected amusement with his moral guidance. And irony is ubiquitous in Renaissance writing.

The texts are arranged in chronological sequence and so reflect the development of Erasmus's style (insofar as we can judge reading in English), his thought and his confidence in his own authority as a spokesman for culture and peace. In 1504 the *Panegyric* was obviously the writing of an impassioned, as yet uninfluential man, forced to flatter the powerful in an effort to make them rule the world as they should, the task that Raphael Hythloday would later reject as useless. In 1509 a mature Erasmus, invited to England with the promise of a new golden age, could write more forcefully the deft and multilevel satire of *The Praise of Folly*, arguably the greatest satire ever written. Even greater confidence can be seen in 1513 with the *Julius Exclusus*, a celebration, no less, of the death of the bellicose Pope Julius and implicitly the accession of the literate Leo X. In 1515 and 1516 his international fame, the favour of princes and the Pope, and the realization that every throne in Europe was occupied by a Christian humanist led to unambiguous exhortations to rulers who just might listen, before power, the interests of corrupt or ignorant courtiers, and "the sport of kings" led them to throw away their new dawn; these appeared as *The Education of a Christian Prince* and *The Complaint of Peace*, closely related to the expansion of the *Adagia* and to that other humanist enigma, More's *Utopia*. Politics and the world took their courses, and by 1528 the respected but detached Erasmus took a calmly bemused view of the silliness of nationalism and even educated humanity in the *Ciceronianus*.

The introductions by the individual translators of the works deal effectively with occasion and composition of each book, the revisions or expansions of the text, the historical context, and purpose and meaning. Only Michael J. Heath, however, seems to give a full discussion of the literary form of the work he translates, setting the much-disputed *Julius Exclusus* among similar dialogues of the time, relating it to the Lucianic dialogues that Erasmus and More had translated into Latin, and discussing the dialogue form as used by Erasmus. Unfortunately, the other translators in general say little about form.

The satires in this collection occur in only three forms. The simplest is the compilation of adages and commentary, a type of writing at which Erasmus excelled, found here in *The Education of a Christian Prince*. Its advantage lies in the clarity of moral guidance and the effect on the reader of the adages, which tend naturally to be remembered. The dialogue is the only form of the three that is predictably humorous, especially with its roots in the *Colloquia* and Lucian; in both *Julius Exclusus* and the *Ciceronianus* Erasmus could produce satiric effect by caricaturing known people, having them make typical but outrageous statements that expose their thoughts to ridicule, and putting in a sort of chorus, while the form itself links the elevated thought of the Platonic dialogue with the blunt common sense of the Lucianic. The oration, finally, has infinite possibilities. Mastering rhetoric was the basis of education; rhetoric taught infinite numbers of devices for amusing and winning over listeners. The form is so unchangeable and so tightly structured that it lends itself to self-parody, as in the deliberately confusing *narratio* of *The Praise of Folly*, with its imitation of the supposedly inane chatter of the woman speaker, intended to draw in the very readers Erasmus intended to attack, and in the elusiveness of the *propositio*. *The Complaint of Peace* is not funny, but it is another oration with a female speaker. Perhaps all this is too obvious to need stating, and perhaps the editor or translators felt that readers should make such observations for themselves. Nevertheless, one translator found room to discuss form and did it very well, and I think that these volumes would have been improved if readers had been given more analysis of the forms by scholars whose skill in Latin and knowledge of each text's surroundings would certainly have made them better students of Erasmus' use of genre than we are.

Betty Radice is the main translator in these volumes, doing the *Panegyric*, *The Praise of Folly*, and *A Complaint of Peace*, three orations, all concerned with the use of power in a Christian manner, all petitions for peace. Of the first she remarks that Erasmus did not greatly enjoy writing it, and indeed the modern reader is not likely to enjoy reading it either. Her text of *The Praise of Folly* is a revision of her well-known and admired Penguin edition of 1971, certainly the best English translation for our time, and her introduction skillfully treats a number of features: the curious background of the work written, Erasmus would have us believe, at More's house shortly after the accession of the humanist Henry VIII, its complex bibliographical history, and its sufferings at the hands of censors and critics, not to mention those who just do not understand it. Her introduction to the *Complaint* relates it nicely to the time it was written, when hopes for peace and wise government and fears of failure were uppermost in Erasmus's mind. To say that she has done all this well will surprise no one.

Michael J. Heath translated the infamous *Julius Exclusus* alone and *The Education of a Christian Prince* with Neil M. Cheshire. Both translations are clear, elegant, and well annotated. Heath's brilliant introduction to the *Julius* is in my opinion the best part of a very good compilation.

Betty I. Knott's translation of the *Ciceronianus* is excellent, with a clear text and, necessarily, very extensive annotation. Both in the notes and in the splendid introduction, she has combined vast learning, skilled use of language, and an undiminished sense of fun, as Erasmus himself would have hoped.

In conclusion, this compilation of satiric works by Erasmus is an indispensable book for students of western culture. For teachers of literature especially, it stands as a guide to much of the thought of Sidney, Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Pope, and Swift; our reading of all these must be enriched by its use.

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

John N. King. *English Reformation Literature: The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1982. Pp.xvi, 539.

Those of us who once formally studied the literature of the Renaissance in university undergraduate English courses, and those of us who now teach it to undergraduates, are part of a tradition of students and teachers who through their acceptance and selection of "appropriate" authors and works of the period perpetuate what the Marxists might call an ideological bias towards Renaissance literature. This ideology is, in large measure, based on what we have been told to accept as good or representative or significant literature of the period. The period's own spokesman for the standard was Sir Philip Sidney. Sidney the theorist defined the acceptable standard of literature in his *Apology for Poetry* and Sidney the poet put the standard into practice in his writing. In our own time we have been told what literature of the Renaissance is good for us by C.S. Lewis in his enormously influential study, *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, Excluding Drama*. Sidney and Lewis share the same prejudices: both, further, are masters of the sweeping generalizations, Sidney in his reluctance to acknowledge the value of anything home-grown, Lewis in his apparent eagerness to use the adjective "drab" to apply to those literary works that do not meet his restrictive categories.

The question arises: why have so many of us felt the need to become members of Sidney and Lewis' party without perhaps really knowing it? Part of the answer to this question surely has to do with the wealth of material that the Renaissance period presents us with and the need to condense this material drastically into a sort of "Greatest Hits of the Renaissance" for the purposes of an eight-month course. Surely if there were world enough and time, would not more of us pay greater attention to John Bale's *The Image of Both Churches* or Robert Crowley's *Philargyrie of Greate Breтайne*? The answer to this question is probably no. For without proper critical editions of these Reformation masterpieces, we cannot reasonably expect anyone - except perhaps for those like King - to endure the rigours of the microfilm reader in order to sample the other traditions that stand behind - or, perhaps, more properly,