in no way inferior to Tasso’s “l’immortal belté de l’auree stelle” (l. 62).

Each of the Seven Days is accompanied by notes, which have been compiled by Professor Gaetano Cipolla and which elucidate the multifarious references in the poem. Many appear to have been translated from those provided by Petrocchi, who is only acknowledged once as a source, and then inaccurately (p. 223, note to l. 102 of Day Two: the reference should be to p. 52), though ultimately this does not detract from their usefulness as aids to understanding. There is some duplication on page 218 of the information provided by Mr. Tusiani on pages xii–xiii of the Introduction concerning the dating of the poem and its aims, but this is a minor point. Those parts of the Introduction itself that are not concerned with the principles of translation, and to which I have already referred, provide an interesting and useful account of the work’s aims and intentions, together with some well-chosen extracts from the English text in connection with critical points. It is a pity there is no identification of the quotations from five Italian writers mentioned on page x, or of that from a sixth on page xiii; one may also point out a certain inconsistency in the style of bibliographical listings on the part of both editors (“Oxford: Clarendon Press” but “Editori Laterza, Bari” in notes 4 and 8 on p. xxii; “ETS: Pisa” but “Firenze, La Nuova Italia” on p. 218), together with an occasional naivety of expression that is rather at odds with the publisher’s claim to provide “the highest quality scholarship” (p. 250), e.g. the last sentence of paragraph three on page xii or the contents of note 9 on page xxii. All in all, however, this is a welcome work that amply fulfills Mr. Tusiani’s modest aim of making Tasso “known a little more and a little better” (p. xxi), not only to those who do not have at least a reading knowledge of Italian but also students (and perhaps even some professional Italianists) who have not had sufficient time or energy to give this opus the attention it deserves.

The book is attractively printed, with wide margins and clear type, bound in sober blue with gold lettering on the spine. There are at least four misprints (on pp. 120, 147, 154, and 156) which hardly detract from the general positive impression.

ALAN BULLOCK, University of Leeds


If the literary critic is always right, the literary historian is always wrong. The hypothetical “true picture” flaws all others. Best, then, to acknowledge one’s impossible role as copyist of an irrecoverable original—and to imagine a permanent empty space on the wall. Some very fine practitioners of the art, most notably Rosamund Tuve and Barbara Lewalski, have explored the use of typology by the devotional lyric poets of the English Renaissance. Ira Clark, as he states in his Introduction, has certainly benefitted from their ideas. But Christ Revealed provokes the wish that he had profitted more thoroughly from their methodological example.
In differentiating his approach from Lewalski's, Clark compliments her "wide-ranging informative presentation of Protestant theories of aesthetics, modes, genres, and styles" (p. xii). He stresses his own narrower focus: "Even in the study of typology itself my definition is more strictly typological than her extensions into allegories and progresses; ... Moreover, my goals are more restricted in immediate subject matter and poetic form." (ibid.) This holds an appealing promise of refinement and application. As the argument unfolds, however, it becomes evident that Clark's limitation of his subject also limits the capacity of typological study to illuminate the poetry. Part of the reason may be that isolating types from related literary devices and intellectual concepts runs counter to the processes of mind that employed them artistically. No doubt the Reformation's literalizing of the Bible fostered a stricter concept of types, along with a renewal of interest in them. But to use types poetically is to draw them into the creative process. Typological thinking becomes a dimension, albeit a distinctive one, of the connection-making mechanism by which the imagination produces metaphoric and structural effects of all kinds. There is reason for the flexibility and breadth of perspective brought to bear by Tuve and Lewalski—and a danger in Clark's single-mindedness.

His initial contracting of his field is natural. He selects Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, Traherne, and Taylor as his main subjects on the grounds that they are the significant poets who use types. He also provides a discussion of Alabaster and Southwell as precursors—a section that, for the freshness of its material and its placement of these poets in the tradition, is one of the most valuable parts of the book. However, when Clark excludes most of the work of his chosen authors according to his strict criteria for what is truly typological, we may feel that he is imposing distinctions alien to the poets themselves. Moreover, as often happens when a standard is established, measurements by that standard acquire overtones of value-judgement. It is a temptingly easy step from observing that "Vaughan uses the word type somewhat loosely" (p. 114) to patronizing Traherne: "Traherne understood typology. But ... he characteristically came to overlook those disparities between type and antitype which Reformed typologists emphasized" (p. 139). This brings us to Clark's central and most problematic self-imposed restriction.

The term "neotype" is his: it refers to the persona of a devotional lyric who identifies with an Old Testament type in order to express spiritual inadequacy yet affirm the promise of salvation through Christ, the antitype. Both the term (equivalent, Clark informs us, to Lewalski's "correlative type" [p. xii]) and the concept may be warmly welcomed. They supply a convenient structure for exploring a poet's imaginative self-projection into the relation between type and antitype. The structure is useful, I believe, precisely because it is adaptable—a set of variables that allows for, indeed highlights, diverse poetic emphases and approaches.

But while the subtitle informs us that he is writing a history, Clark too often gives the impression that he is inventing one. For instead of exploiting the elasticity of his concept, he consistently measures poets and poems against an ideal version of it, a fixed ration among type, antitype, and neotype that he considers "the fullest exploitation of the expressive potential for poetry of the Reformed strict definition and personal application of types" (p. 106). It turns out that this ideal scarcely
exists—it is achieved only in a relatively few lyrics by George Herbert. Herbert’s predecessors were groping towards it, discovering necessary components here and there, while it was “reinterpreted, expanded, and exploded” (ibid.) by his successors. What might simply seem suggestively different uses of typology within a common tradition are presented as anticipations of, or departures from, a “pure” model. Thus Vaughan, by his “inversion of types and neotypes” (p. 132)—that is, portraying contemporary man as inferior to Old Testament types—is said to have produced the “antipodal neotypological lyric” (a label as unnecessary as it is ungainly). In Traherne, “the neotypological lyric dissolves and suffuses through the fusion and then infinite expansion of expression in the persona, creation, and God, “whereas Taylor causes it to “explode through their fission” (p. 159). After this, understandably, “the neotypological lyric was finished . . . the potential of neotypology for powering and forming specifically Christian lyrics, for founding a literary aesthetic, had been exhausted” (pp. 185-86). All of this sounds less like literary than natural history—the rise and fall of a species: the chimaera, perhaps.

Our openness to Clark’s argument is inevitably affected by his style. It is relentlessly polysyllabic and elliptical. There are obstacles to smooth reading, even to comprehension, on nearly every page. Minor irritants range from grating infelicities (“His open-ended catalogues heap to endlessness . . .” [p. 156]) to grammatical errors (“. . . mends its mortal flaws like he repairs the rime . . . [p. 96]). It is incongruous to find so many lapses of this sort in a book on which the more mechanical kinds of editorial care have evidently been lavished: the volume is handsomely produced and printed; I noted no typographical errors.

Clark’s scholarship is exhaustive, as his bibliography attests, and well integrated. His subject is rich, his approach potentially exciting. It is a pity to see such obvious talents, such energies, and such good intentions all but neutralized by a combination of excessive rigour and the lack of it.

RICHARD HILLMAN, York University


Accouchement en milieu “naturel,” démédicalisation, naissance “sans violence” font de nos jours l’objet de revendications qui opposent les femmes au pouvoir médical. S’il est en voie de trouver de nouvelles solutions, le problème n’est pas nouveau, il remonte au XVIIIe siècle alors que le savoir prend le pas sur la tradition, que l’homme-chirurgien l’emporte sur la sage-femme au nom d’un progrès dont l’accouchée et la société toute entière font les frais.

Dans une tentative d’histoire globale fort bien réussie, Mireille Laget s’attache à décrire le vécu de l’accouchement dans la société française traditionnelle (XVIe–XVIIIe siècles). Le tableau qu’elle en brosse a de quoi faire frémir. Manque d’hygiène érigé en superstitions (sitôt né, l’enfant est recouvert d’une peau de mouton dernièrement écorché), opérations magiques pratiquées dans le