surprised *how* much) concerns the proper and improper uses of erotic energy. There is little here to startle the Dante expert, but much useful bringing together for others of the strands of this theme in *Hell*, *Purgatory*, and *Paradise*. I found particularly perceptive Radcliff-Umstead's commentary on *Purgatory*, Cantos XV to XIX, the conversation between Virgil and the pilgrim on universal love and the pilgrim's dream of the "stuttering woman" (pp. 70–76). There is a successful balance between the doctrinal and the dramatic in this commentary, or, more accurately, a fusion of the two. The author uses Virgil's analysis in this section as a basis for his explanation of the pilgrim's problematic passage through the wall of fire into heaven. The essay shows us a basically Augustinian and Aquinian Dante, not a revisionist one, and its simple, perhaps inevitable, structure follows the pilgrim on his journey. It provides a useful, inclusive, well annotated guide to the sexual sequences in the *Comedy* and gives ample, wide-ranging scholarly notes.

Human Sexuality in the Middle Ages and Renaissance covers a broad historical range of materials, from the early Fathers to sixteenth-century drama and seventeenth-century fiction. Studies of texts in Latin, English, Italian, German, and French are included. Most of the individual essays are broad in conception, pointing up general conclusions based on a consideration of multiple sources. As a volume, therefore, the book does not so much advance specific scholarly debates in each of the narrower fields it treats as it makes available generally sound overviews of big issues to a wider group of scholars and teachers. For such an audience, I would like to see all foreign language passages translated into English, either in brackets in the text or in footnotes. Also there are too many typographical errors, and the pages are too closely printed for pleasurable reading.

PEGGY A. KNAPP, *Carnegie-Mellon University*

T. Wilson Hayes. *Winstanley the Digger. A Literary Analysis of Radical Ideas in the English Revolution*. Cambridge, Mass., and London: Harvard University Press, 1979, Pp. viii, 258. \$16.50.

The appearance of a book on Gerrard Winstanley by someone trained as a literary scholar is an event worth marking. Winstanley was one of the true originals of his time. He deserves reading for the liveliness of his prose, the boldness of his imagination, and the sheer force of his vision of English society transformed by the power of the Spirit he saw spreading through the land. Winstanley has been celebrated as a proto-communist since the late nineteenth century. More recently, Christopher Hill has aroused wider interest in Winstanley and has placed him in the context of contemporary radical thought, most notably in *The World Turned Upside Down* and his Penguin edition of the works. Now T. Wilson Hayes, much influenced by Hill, has offered a sustained argument for regarding Winstanley as a poet-prophet in the tradition of Langland and Blake.

Hayes proceeds chronologically through Winstanley's works, including the three early treatises not reproduced in George H. Sabine's useful modern edition. By painstaking analyses of individual tracts Hayes gradually builds a picture of Winstan-

ley's dominant images and the development of his thought. The advantage of his approach is that it allows the reader to see Winstanley's brief career as writer and public figure unfold as he moves from the intensely personal vision of his first tract, to the apocalyptic writings in which he proclaimed and defended the efforts of the "Diggers" to show how the earth might be made once more a "common treasury," to his more sober prescription for reorganizing English society in *The Law of Freedom in a Platform*. Its disadvantage is that one is marched through everything, often by way of plodding paraphrase.

One of the most useful services that Hayes performs is to trace key images (such as seed, fire, the sun of righteousness) through the works, attempting along the way to place them in relevant intellectual traditions. Another is to build a cumulative sense of what he sees as Winstanley's dialectic of internal and external forces. This is fundamentally the opposition of spirit and flesh that Winstanley finds everywhere and renders as a contest of opposites, including light and darkness, love and the "covetous power," Jacob and Esau. Hayes shows how Winstanley adapts much of his terminology from the Bible, reading it more as "metaphorical history" than as a literal record of events. His discussion of the visionary *Fire in the Bush* illustrates well Winstanley's talent for elaborating mythic patterns he found in Scripture. Here Eden becomes an inner state suggesting the possibilities for the recovery of innocence, the Fall a continuous process by which society yields to selfish impulses.

Hayes effectively demonstrates Winstanley's indebtedness to Joachite ideas of history, his place in a line of English reformers extending from Wycliffe, and his affinities with radical preachers of his own time such as John Everard and John Saltmarsh, some of whose similarities to Winstanley were noted by Sabine. His efforts to place Winstanley in the context of the radical reformation constitute the book's most important contribution. Efforts to link him with other intellectual traditions are sometimes more dubious. It makes relatively little sense to force Winstanley's wild allegorizing of the Bible into the fourfold method of exegesis, or to compare his identification of God with "Reason" – for Winstanley an extraordinarily loose term – with Milton's use of right reason. Nor does one need to see Winstanley as dependent upon John Foxe for his habit of identifying England with Israel. It is curious that Hayes stresses the influence of the relatively conservative author of the *Book of Martyrs* and ignores Winstanley's spiritual kinship with his contemporary George Fox. Winstanley bears strong resemblances to the early Quakers: in his symbolic use of biblical names, his preoccupation with the workings of the Spirit, his assumption of the manner of an Old Testament prophet, and his concern with recovering a pure language, among other things. If Hayes had recognized these affinities, especially with regard to the importance for each of the critical and pervasive action of the Holy Spirit, he might have been less quick to accept Hill's questionable labelling of Winstanley as a materialistic pantheist.

In his enthusiasm Hayes overstates the case for Winstanley as political thinker, as hero of a new proletariat, and as poet-prophet. Winstanley was indeed a passionate defender of the ordinary Englishman against the multiple abuses he blamed upon clergy, lawyers, landlords and others he saw as being in bondage to a material world, but Marxist terminology has limited relevance to the kind of struggle in which he was engaged. It does make sense to see Winstanley as writing a visionary prose that

belongs in what may fairly be called the tradition of prophecy, and to see him as anticipating Blake in interesting ways, as Hill and M.H. Abrams have. Hayes forces comparisons with a whole host of poets, however, in an apparent effort to establish his significance as a literary figure. Something of Winstanley's distinctiveness escapes in the process. He took pride in what he called his "clownish" (or "country") language. In fact, the prose can be repetitious and dense as well as rough, the tracts themselves poorly shaped. Winstanley appeals for the vigor and freshness of his writing despite a relative lack of conscious artistry.

One should not complain too much, however, about a work as thorough and useful as this one. If Hayes's claims for Winstanley and his intellectual tradition are at times excessive or misplaced, he nonetheless succeeds in illuminating the shape of the career and in making an extremely private vision more accessible. His analyses of the major tracts, including *The New Law of Righteousness* and *Fire in the Bush*, supply new contexts for understanding them and should win readers for a writer who deserves a place in an expanded canon of English literature.

JOHN R. KNOTT, JR., *University of Michigan*