First, there are a number of clarifications to be made. Robert F. Storey's *Pierrot, A Critical History of a Mask*, is not a book on English literature, although its best chapter, the last, is on Eliot and Stevens.

*Pierrot* is the biography of a *commedia dell'arte* character transposed by history, according to its author, onto the European proscenium stage in the 18th Century, into predominantly French Romantic and symbolist poses in the 19th Century, and into a more purely symbolic figure in 20th Century English verse. As such, *Pierrot* suggests to us that it is one of these new interdisciplinary books, touching on French, English and Italian literature, spread out over several centuries, by which some academic presses are said to be attempting to break the narrow jaws of deficit-producing highly specialist publishing.

Secondly, a few definitions are in order, as *Pierrot* is a tightly argued book. To appreciate it we must immediately dispel our erroneous presumptions that spring readily to mind because of its title. *Pierrot* is a history, not of the tradition of a play-acting figure or of the literary movements that such a figure served; rather, it is the interpretative narrative of the occurrences of a name behind which a number of authors over a very long period of time chose to present some specific attitudes related to their apprehension of the real world. The "mask" of the title is moreover not the personality mask of modern psychology, or the theatrical genre of the Renaissance court, or the facial representation of a stock figure. The "mask" is any character in *commedia dell'arte*, the word being derived by Storey from the masks worn by secondary characters in the plays of its "classical period" (p. 4). Each mask was, and is, a collection of human qualities, and the word used in this fashion is pivotal to Storey's innovation and criticism, as, he writes, the masks born in the *commedia* survived it and reappeared in later literary, musical and theatrical genres. The particular mask in question is Pierrot, who incarnated a quizzical reaction to life with comedy because he refused to take life itself seriously, and he treated the other "masks" or figures of *commedia dell'arte* with the wit that their inherent absurdity, like his, deserved. Storey writes that the "mask" of Pierrot persisted beyond the demise of the *commedia dell'arte* as the need to express his significance is, like Hamlet's indecision, always with us.

In the realm of scholarship, Storey's reader will notice the absence of reference to *The Fool: His Social and Literary History* (1935), whose author, Enid Welsford,
in a later chapter touching on the same historical proofs as he (the Théâtre des Funambules, the scenarii of Flaminio Scala, the actor Hamoche and Deburau), reached different conclusions. He will note in David Madden’s *Harlequin’s Stick: Charlie’s Cane* (1975), which Storey does not note, as well as in Welsford’s book, earlier claims than his to Charlie Chaplin’s ancestry in Pierrot and Harlequin. In Allardyce Nicoll’s *Masks, Mimes and Miracles* (1931), the reader will find greater sensitivity to the organic unity of the figures in a *commedia dell’arte* play. However, none of these can derogate from *Pierrot* unless the reader personally has a need for them. Storey’s work is a “critical history” springing from his assumption that a mask was transferrable from one genre to another in a variety of languages in different eras, and on that rests its value. His criticism is historical in the sense that it seeks out the causes and effects determining the recurrences of Pierrot’s mask from country to country and century to century. It is not historical in the sense of revealing laterally, in a limited time and in a given place, the relation of a mask to a living culture. The price of Storey’s internationalism is not so much historical interest as cultural depth. Because of his pivotal conception of the mask, Storey could be expected to open his argument onto philosophy and psychology. However, with the exception of long pertinent references to Schopenhauer in the French romantic movement, he does not.

Storey’s book tends to devote chapters, or clearly delineated parts of chapters, to individual manifestations of Pierrot’s mask in West European phenomena like the *commedia dell’arte* and the English clown, and in dominant literary figures like Laforgue. The connection of this structure to his argument is evident and sound. The backbone of Storey’s study is creative criticism rather than informative scholarship, and he is not interested in filling in cultural history. His chapters are really stages in an argument or in the adventures of Storey’s idea of how Pierrot has “survived four centuries of social and philosophical change, managing to adapt to the world in which he momentarily finds himself with remarkable pliability and success” (p. 3). The argument is interesting rather than convincing, which does not mean that we do not immediately share deeply its author’s conviction. Storey’s argument supposes that a *commedia dell’arte* mask could impose itself on literary history through the intervention of particular writers, performers and painters as diverse as Pellesini, Gherardi, Watteau, Molière, Gautier and Eliot, through a series of direct influences traceable by a modern commentator. Storey’s reader will find it difficult to accept this assumption on face value, not so much because so many different national contexts are involved, but because they belonged to so many different centuries. Yet, the reader is stunned, as though reading the correct interpretation for the first time, of Storey’s treatment of Eliot’s “Prufrock”.

Being a professor of English, Storey is perhaps best imagined, in the mind of this reviewer, as having been originally attracted to his subject by Stevens and Eliot. This would explain the powerful critical pertinence of the second to last chapter on the French symbolist movement in general and Laforgue in particular to the two American poets who form the subject of his concluding pages. Storey’s historical method, it can also be thought, has been to attempt to fix the origins of the Pierrot figure among French nineteenth-century writers and twentieth-century English poets progressively backwards in time, but to begin writing at the beginning. He deals with the French fairs and the Opéra Comique in the eighteenth century, *Le Théâtre*
Italien in the late seventeenth century and the Pedrolino figure of the travelling Italian player troops coming into mid-sixteenth century France, in order to show the origins of a mask rather than of a particular class of clown. Storey necessarily eliminates competing clowns like Harlequin, Gilles and Crispin as their masks are not Pierrot’s. However, Storey’s reader will hardly miss them, as amid a welter of details about theatrical history he learns that, in one of his French Romantic manifestations, Pierrot macabre tickled his wife to death.

Pierrot is beautifully printed and well illustrated, and its cover is white, like the clown’s dress in Watteau’s painting, and its end sheets, like his buttons, are black.

ANTHONY RASPA, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi


The three volumes of Milton studies here under review contain scholarly examinations of Milton’s major poems, his prose, and some of his lesser poetry. The problem for the reviewer in marshalling this variety and doing justice to thirty assorted articles is somewhat relieved by the fact that Volume XI has a theme and its substance can therefore be considered separately.

The eleven articles of Volume IX and the thirteen in Volume X provide nine concerning Paradise Lost, two about Samson Agonistes, and one dealing with Paradise Regained. Five essays discuss some aspect of Milton’s prose, and seven treat minor poems. This distribution presents no surprises. Milton obviously continues to provide an effective stimulus to scholars with all aspects of his work; although interest primarily focuses upon Paradise Lost, his other work remains the source of lively discussion and penetrating scholarly analysis.

It is disappointing, however, that amongst all this material there is but one article on Paradise Regained (Richard D. Jordan, “Paradise Regained and the Second Adam,” X); even more disappointing than the paucity of material on the brief epic is the fact that Professor Jordan’s article does little to illuminate our understanding of the poem. Although he concludes that “PR is dramatically forceful” (273), his consideration of Christ as Second Adam fails to provide the character with dramatic intensity. Rather the reverse is true, for the article concerns itself primarily with ways Christ differs from rather than resembles Adam. If we are to be aware of the dramatic effectiveness of Paradise Regained, we must be made to understand that Christ voluntarily accepts the role of second Adam, abjures his divinity, allows the satanic full play, and resists evil with only the same capacity for Right Reason that all Adams and Eves share.