Catherine held in England left more or less complete official records and some of the *acta* produced for and by the courts. As is well known, there were many references to those trials in tracts of the time and in ambassadors' reports. By and large it is these latter records, records that for all their merits tended to be partisan and all too often were little more than gossip, that have been the historians' main sources. Until the present volume, the records of the courts themselves have not been used to anything like the extent that has been proved to be possible. This point could be developed further, but the matter is best pursued in Professor Kelly's treatment of it. For the moment it is sufficient to underline the magnitude of his contribution to scholarship by bringing this material into the discussion at last.

The result is a compact, difficult but highly instructive volume. The author leads his reader through the stages of the different trials and petitions for dispensation, describing procedures and setting out the canon law on matters not likely to be understood. Sometimes he shows a certain lack of judgment here: a difficult subject is made all the more obscure by a tendency to enter into discussions or add tidbits of information that distract from the main thrust of the work. Be this as it may, as a background to the problems of the king's marriages, the author presents a remarkably full view of the law and jurisprudence touching matrimony in Europe just before the medieval synthesis would receive its first major adjustment in the new laws of different states and the constitutions of the Council of Trent. The network of impediments, kept more or less in equitable balance by the papal power of dispensation, is presented with due subtlety and clarity. It was on the exercise of that power and the debate as to its extent that the king's matter hinged.

Since Kelly focuses so sharply on the matrimonial side of Henry's adult life and its immense consequences for his circle of friends as for the country in general and its foreign policy, the volume produces a foreshortened perspective that might lead to an unbalanced view of the reign as a whole. That is a minor risk, one more than compensated for by the insight into Henry's character that is forthcoming. It is with good reason that the author claims to have shown "not only a consistent concern on the king's part to justify himself before God, but also a remarkable consistency in his views" (p. 276). Of course one may have to conclude that the conscientious king who was capable of such a consummately legalistic and thoroughly inequitable use of courts, evidence and statute-making power was more of a monster than the cynical monarch who would have his way with a pretty woman. As Henry emerges from his many trials, he may well pass into the hands of the psychohistorian.

MICHAEL M. SHEEHAN, *Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto*

The Elizabethan Theatre VI: Papers Given at the Sixth International Conference on Elizabethan Theatre Held at the University of Waterloo, Ontario in July 1975, edited and with an introduction by G.R. Hibbard. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1978. Pp. xiii, 161. \$11.95.

This conference, whose papers here appear with a succinct introduction by Professor Hibbard, mainly focussed upon the adult and children's theatres between approxi-

mately 1599 and 1608 — an era from which (as this volume shows) historical and critical problems abound. The Waterloo conference is important for historians of the theatre, because it has often been the occasion for presentation of important scholarly evidence or re-interpretations. Richard Hosley here presents the first of two papers (the second was given in 1977), in which he attempts his reconstruction of the Fortune playhouse. He lists four important previous attempts (it is a pity that illustrations are not included, to make clear the variety of results the evidence has allowed). Professor Hosley carefully examines the wording of the contract drawn between Philip Henslowe and his carpenter Peter Streete, and weights its sometimes mystifying terminology against the Hope contract, the evidence of exterior views, and his extensive researches into sixteenth-century building materials and methods. In considering the design of the frame, he considers two particular puzzles. First, the “Jutteý forwardes” in “either” of the two upper stories: Professor Hosley takes “either” to mean “both,” sensibly arguing that if one or the other was intended, the author of the contract would have known and specified which. Second, considering the depth of the stage and the design of the tiring-house, Professor Hosley suggests that the author of the contract did not know the design of the tiring-house and so was unclear about the depth of the stage; hence resort was made to defining only the outer limit of the stage as “the middle of the yarde.” But the author presumably had access to the “plott thereof drawn” to which he refers, and it seems questionable to assume here that he would be unsure about design details in drawing up a legal instrument. Without the “plott,” certainty will probably forever elude us in such details: the practical solutions here put forward certainly seem reasonable. The second paper will deal with matters of the stage, its superstructure, and the tiring-house facade: we await it with keen interest.

Reavley Gair’s paper, “The Presentation of Plays at Second Paul’s: The Early Phase (1599-1602),” presents important original evidence about the location of the playhouse used by the company. He works at first from Marston’s plays *Antonio and Mellida*, *Jack Drum’s Entertainment*, and *Antonio’s Revenge*, along with William Percy’s manuscript plays, to establish the conditions of performance, the flavour of such occasions, and the size of the stage. On the last, the evidence yields an ambiguous result: “small, but large enough to hold seventeen actors at one time, provided that they were not wearing wide costumes.” Having established the intimate nature of this coterie theatre, Professor Gair turns next to the difficult question of where, exactly, these plays were performed: he rejects earlier suggestions because the sites do not, for him, satisfy the conditions laid down in the contemporary evidence. Professor Gair has discovered the presentments made to Bishop Bancroft’s 1598 visitation, and has found in one of these a description of “a house builte in the shrowdes by Mr. Haydon sometyme petticannon of this church.” In his view, this house “fulfills all the conditions imposed by contemporary descriptions for the Paul’s theatre”: he locates it, describes it, and offers it as the site. The argument is very persuasive, accompanied as it is with documentary and pictorial evidence. Perhaps the area in question was not large enough for the playhouse, unless the house had invaded the adjacent cloisters and the undercroft of the chapter house. Assuredly, Professor Gair’s findings will stir continued debate, and will have to be very seriously considered by future investigators.

Professor Gair’s remarks on the flavour of a boys’ performance provide a transition

to Neil Carson's paper, "John Webster: The Apprentice Years," in which he argues that the inconsistencies and tensions one sees in Webster's mature plays are traceable to his early collaborations with Dekker for the Paul's boys. This company demanded a style of self-conscious theatricalism and artifice, owing to the inability of boy actors to convey convincingly a range of mature emotion. Professor Carson argues that the inconsistencies evident in such a text as, for example, *Westward Ho!*, may proceed not from its collaborative origins but from the uneasy marriage of an older, illusionistic, dramatic style with the new style brought into vogue by the "little eyases." There seems to me to exist a danger of circularity in this argument. While we are admittedly ignorant about methods of collaboration, we cannot ignore the question of authorship altogether, since the inconsistencies in a play like *Westward Ho!* may well proceed from "two imperfectly aligned creative imaginations," however they may have worked together.

Professor Carson's attention to the theatrical realities of the texts is refreshing, and will be welcomed by those who explore the viability of these plays in their own theatres and in our own. With "*The Revenger's Tragedy* Revived," Stanley Wells presents an engaging account of the modern revival of Tourneur's play by the Royal Shakespeare Theatre. He was able to draw upon reviews, his own attendance at performances, and the promptbooks (from which he presents John Barton's additions to the text). The resulting account of the production provides assurance of the possibilities of the play in the modern theatre, albeit in a version altered to speed up the action, to increase the sexual suggestiveness and violence, and to reduce the play's Christian frame of reference. Dr. Wells argues that the production was basically true to the play in realizing the ironically comic energy in the text — an energy and comedy which, he suggests, are more apparent in performance than in reading.

Dr. Wells notes that while some reviewers welcomed the comedy in *The Revenger's Tragedy*, others were disturbed by the feeling that the director was "seeking to make fun of the characters." But do not Jacobean playwrights sometimes do this? This question was approached by William Babula and R.A. Foakes in relation to *The Malcontent*, and different answers resulted. Professor Babula discusses Malevole as an avenger-satirist, the morally wholesome educator of a sexually corrupt society, and he sees the character as the successful solution to a problem which Marston had grappled with in the Antonio plays. Malevole's speeches of explicit moralization receive stress in this approach. Professor Foakes contrasts *The Malcontent* with *The Revenger's Tragedy*: he argues that a balance of seriousness and farce informs the latter play, whereas Marston is not able to convince us of the integration of seriousness and cross-capers in his hero, whose moralization is undercut by his gleeful verbal excesses and his actions. Professor Foakes suggests that these facets would be more apparent in the theatre; he ends with a timely plea for productions of plays like *The Malcontent* so we can better appreciate their theatrical energies and meanings.

Turning attention to Shakespeare, M.C. Bradbrook discusses his career in the "multiple theatres" of Jacobean London. The plays of the period provide evidence that Jacobean audiences were self-conscious and were aware of the distinct styles of the various theatres — this naturally resulted from the growing concentration of drama in London. Professor Bradbrook treats several of Shakespeare's Jacobean

plays to show his response to an age when "there was not one theatre, but many, and they took to parody and jest of one another, without necessarily feeling rancour." Finally, in place of D.F. Rowan's paper (not delivered because of illness) Professor Hibbard has included his paper, "Love, Marriage and Money in Shakespeare's Theatre and Shakespeare's England." He agrees that Shakespeare responded (albeit indirectly) to the Jacobean age's concerns — here with marriage as a means to wealth and power. For direct treatment of these social concerns, Middleton is singled out for his use of a contemporary London setting. Contrasting the two playwrights, Professor Hibbard concludes: "Middleton is a master of dissection, but he does not know how to breathe life into a dream. Shakespeare does, and into no other idea did he breathe more life than that of love as an absolute value."

Of the conference as a whole, one is impressed at once by the speakers' impressive powers of dissection and their regard for the Elizabethan Theatre as a living art.

J.A.B. SOMERSET, *University of Western Ontario*

Alastair Fowler. *Conceitful Thought: The Interpretation of English Renaissance Poems*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1975. Pp. viii, 152. \$11.00.

The now Regius Professor of English at Edinburgh has established a public personality through a large number of works. To whatever literary problem he has brought his attention, a boldly original rearrangement of its mastered constituents has produced answers — not merely numerological ones — which daunt less cerebral readers by their intellectual power and complexity. Rooted as he is in the historical discipline of Renaissance literary studies, and gifted with sensitivity, he cannot be faulted, like many adventurous structuralists and sociological or psychologizing writers about literature, for ignorance of the facts or outrageous textual imperceptivity. He is often applauded or condemned for the wrong reasons, because fundamental comprehension of his unconventional and complex writings is so demanding for students of literature. The effort to comprehend ought, however, to be made. His is one of the most original and valuable minds in our field, although his self-confident boldness often leads him up many storied-towers of inference to conclusions which merit intelligent opposition.

The present book, which contains material on the earlier Tudors, Sidney, Spenser, Shakespeare, the Metaphysicals, and Jonson's *To Penshurst*, begins unaccustomedly under the sign manual of uncertainty, with a chapter on Wyatt. Truth is theoretically attainable concerning 16th- and 17th-century lyrics, Fowler says, but is much more difficult to reach than most critics think: in the case of Wyatt because of our ignorance of the courtly context to which each poem may have been a response, and because of our inability to imagine our way into a courtly ethos of love (this latter is a little overstated). More generally, he asks, how far should we dare to press our iconographical analyses and our interpretations in terms of other symbolic means which we know were shared in the Renaissance? Often not so far as we do push them, answers Fowler disarmingly. All the more strongly, however, the truth