moderate and balanced perception of him prevailed in the Catholic Netherlands. On the side of the Protestants the differences of opinion were less dramatic, the predominant attitude being one of unease. In Basel his memory was treasured, however, while the Anglicans rediscovered the merit of his sweet moderation and seekers and sectarians fathomed the depth of what they perceived to be his camouflaged radicalism. In a way, it was the radical interpretation of Erasmus that gained momentum after 1650 when he was restored to respectability as an honoured citizen of the "république des lettres." Harrassed Arminians found solace in reading his works, and despite his stand on free will, so did equally harrassed Jansenists. Full-length biographies and, above all, Jean Le Clerc's careful edition of his works and his correspondence (Leiden 1703–06) placed a wealth of solid information at the disposal of those who chose to examine it.

Mansfield's book offers particularly careful and enlightening discussions of some themes that have recently retained the attention of Erasmus scholars. Erasmus had always been known to be born out of wedlock, but the traditional assumption that, at the time of his birth, his father was a priest in Gouda, has recently been challenged (see J.K. McConica in *Collected Works of Erasmus* IV, 188–90). Mansfield shows that it had been challenged before (pp. 47, 185, 243f.), but also that it originated in 1582 with Cornelius Loos, who was himself from Gouda, knew the local gossip, and had no axe to grind. The essential point of Loos' story was confirmed at about the same time by the better-informed Petrus Opmeer (pp. 43–44, cf pp. 9, 129). Another subject of much recent debate is the meaning of Ortensio Lando's dialogue *In Des. Erasmi Roterodami funus* (Basel 1540). This reviewer has thought for some time that the dialogue is primarily a satire, not on Erasmus, but on those who, in Lando's view, tended to overrate him and reacted to his death with either adulation or anathematization. Mansfield seems to move in the same direction: Lando's "incoherence and ambiguity," he says, "are genuine and presumably deliberate" (p. 107). Let us hope that Mansfield's excellent and elegantly written book will soon encourage a full-length study of the interpretations of Erasmus from Voltaire to Huizinga. Contemporaries sometimes unfairly called Erasmus a chameleon. It is not so much that he himself keeps changing his colour, but rather that he forces those who write about him to show theirs.

PETER G. BIETENHOLZ, *University of Saskatchewan*

Andrew M. McLean. *Shakespeare, Annotated Bibliographies and Media Guide for Teachers*. Urbana: National Council of Teachers of English, 1980. Pp. ix, 277. \$11.90.

Beyond idolatry Shakespeare has always inspired a zeal to explore and explicate his "beauties," a pattern established by Dryden and Pope and so continued through the centuries. Thus at first glance it may seem quite unremarkable that a book of 277 pages should be devoted entirely to citations of books, articles, films and recordings concerned with teaching the work of one author. Indeed, in the past decade there has been a veritable movement established for this purpose.

Andrew McLean's articles and bibliographies have been in the forefront of this

movement, and he is thus eminently qualified to present this full-scale bibliography and media guide. The book is divided into three major sections. The first section offers scholarship useful for teaching in primary and secondary schools and in colleges, with subdivisions for individual plays, for the poems and for teaching Shakespeare in tandem with other authors. The second section is reserved for Shakespeare on film and television. The final section is of a different order; it is a guide to audio-visual materials concerned with Shakespeare, his plays, his times and his theater, with a useful directory of producers and distributors of these materials.

The guide reveals a great deal of care and thought with regard to its content. The approach is broad. Selections cover approximately one hundred years of scholarship. The range of teaching spans third-grade students (p. 8) to graduate-level students (p. 79), and includes an article for slow readers (p. 100). Articles in foreign languages and foreign-language films are included. Professor McLean has wisely chosen to define *teaching* in the broadest sense, so that we find articles by and about noted scholars and teachers of Shakespeare, such as Peter Alexander (p. 150), A.C. Bradley (pp. 71, 74, 82, 149), and George Lyman Kittredge (pp. 73, 82). Annotations are generous and useful, with reviews for controversial titles cited. Items are cross-referenced to related subjects.

Here is a cornucopia to satisfy any teacher's wish for guidance. Articles discuss character, plot, the poetry, songs, the period and the life. There is Shakespeare for boys (p. 117), for girls (pp. 12, 31–32), and for students in Africa (p. 73), Britain (pp. 39, 81), Bulgaria (p. 107), Germany (pp. 3, 72–73, 78), India (pp. 30, 78, 80), Japan (p. 78), Malaya (p. 27), Moscow (pp. 33), Sri Lanka (p. 34), Sweden (p. 34), as well as in Appalachia (p. 83) and Harlem, in New York (p. 32).

The section on teaching Shakespeare with other authors offers expected links with his coevals, Marlowe, Milton and Spenser and, predictably, with a broad range of authors whom he has influenced. Among these, Fenimore Cooper, J.D. Salinger and Orwell should prove helpful for weaning grammar and high school students from authors whom they already know and enjoy on to discover their sources in Shakespeare. Oddly enough, I found no citation for Dickens and Shakespeare.

The second section deals with methods of teaching, filming and acting, with useful discussions on the value of film in classroom teaching. Sixty pages are allotted to reviews and commentary on twenty-five films, with a smaller section on reviews of televised versions of the plays.

Professor McLean has done teachers a great service in bringing together so much widely-dispersed material. At the risk of seeming ungenerous, however, I must admit noting the lack of a citation for Helge Kökeritz's book and recording, *Shakespeare's Pronunciation* (Yale, 1953 and 1954, respectively), and for the illuminating essay by Robert Penn Warren, "Pure and Impure Poetry" (pp. 320–40, in *An Introduction to Literary Criticism*, edited by Marlies K. Danziger and W. Stacy Johnson; Heath, 1961), which may be found in many anthologies.

The guide exhibits a high standard of accuracy, although a few minor corrections may be noted: Kozelka, Paul (not Kozekla, p. 196); Elledge, Scott (not Scott, Elledge, p. 81); "Lear's Comic Vision" (not *Spirit*, p. 91). The entry for Haas, Rudolf in *Shakespeare Jahrbuch* should cite the Heidelberg publication (not Weimar, p. 72). Entries are out of alphabetical order on pp. 151, 176, 180–81, and *Merchant of Venice* should precede *Midsummer Night's Dream* in the headings on p. 94.

Whereas much attention has been given to the content of this guide, too little has been given to the format and it therefore lacks methodological rigor. Thus the sections for teaching and for film are subdivided for individual plays while the section for television is not. Further, most of the subdivisions for individual plays are typeset with the play's title in italics, setting it off from the entries which follow, but the corresponding section for films (pp. 145–205), prints the title and entries in the same type as the criticism which succeeds it, making research in this section unnecessarily difficult. Moreover, although essays in collections are in most cases entered under the author's name, separately for each essay, in one case the entire collection is entered under the editor's name (p. 3), with the essays noted in the annotation.

A more serious flaw is the book's lack of indexes. A work of this size (the publisher claims there are about 2,250 entries) and scope deserves a subject, title and author index. The main value of the guide is in its making information available about a particular play, a method of teaching, the choice of a media form. These subjects are scattered throughout the book. Yet the teacher who purchases and takes the time to master the book's intricacies will be well rewarded. The researcher who turns to it for quick reference will be less well served.

DOROTHY E. LITT, *Flushing, New York*

On King Lear, edited by Lawrence Danson. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1981. Pp. 185. \$15.00

This lively and enjoyable collection of eight lectures "delivered at Princeton by members of the Princeton University English Department during the academic year 1978–79" indeed retains the "sense of the individual voice that more formal essay-writing tends to flatten" (3). The full essays, suitable for specialist and non-specialist alike, are often wide-ranging and synthesizing, as well as discriminating. This is a volume interested in the experience of the play, in its shape in performance, and in tragedy as not "making sense"; it emphasizes what *King Lear* does to our consciousness. One of the essays, G.E. Bentley's "Shakespeare, the King's Company and *King Lear*" (on the importance of information we now have access to about Shakespeare as actor, shareholder and attached dramatist in a particular theatrical company) is largely factual. However, with the exception of Alvin Kernan's "*King Lear* and the Shakespearian Pageant of History" and Thomas P. Roche's "'Nothing Almost Sees Miracles': Tragic Knowledge in *King Lear*" (both of which will be discussed later), the remaining essays are not principally interested in recovering possible contemporaneous codings of universal themes.

The volume in many ways exemplifies the movement in *Lear* criticism – which began in the 1960's – away from an "ideological" approach that sought to establish the moral substructure of the play in formulaic terms, often at the expense of tragic effect (as, for example, in such work as Virgil K. Whittaker's), and toward a stress "on the poignantly human experience that *King Lear* embodies" (G.R. Hibbard, "'King Lear': A Retrospect, 1939–79," *Shakespeare Survey*, 33 [1980], 10). Six of the eight approaches are concordant with the idea that "the rhetoric of good and evil"