(Grazzini's *La strega*). Yet, whatever his stance, by his mozaic of juxtaposition he always emphasises the profound intellectual and philosophical foundation of Renaissance drama, and even when one disagrees with his reading, disagreement itself forces new understanding on the reader. *The Theater and the Dream* is a seminal book in Renaissance drama. Notwithstanding Professor Cope's difficult latinate style, he enables us to transcend received paradigms of criticism.

WILLIAM DEAN, *University of Otago*

The Diary of John Manningham of the Middle Temple, 1602-3. Edited by Robert Parker Sorlien. Hanover: The University Press of New England, 1976. Pp. xi, 467.

When a performance of *Twelfth Night* was given in the Middle Temple as a feature of the Templars' post-Christmas festivities in 1602, it was witnessed by a law student in his twenties from Kent via Cambridge who had been keeping a casual diary and commonplace book for a year or so, and now jotted down approvingly the "good practice" of setting up Malvolio in folly, and identified Olivia, in a fascinating error, as "his Lady widdowe."

Some months later, on Sunday June 20, the Diarist recorded the gist of a sermon at St. Paul's by Robert Wakeman of Oxford. Wakeman's text was Jonah 3: 4-5, and when he published this sermon a few years later, he observed that it had been interrupted by a sudden cloudburst — at precisely the point in the text where our Diarist broke off, fleeing, no doubt, an equinoctial drenching! And in March of the next year, the same recorder described in detail the final decline and death of Queen Elizabeth, as reported to him by an eyewitness, his friend the Queen's chaplain Dr. Henry Parry. "This morning about 3 at clocke her Majestie departed from this life, mildly like a lambe, easily like a ripe apple from the tree. . . ."

Who else but John Manningham, and what else but his universally-quoted but rarely-consulted *Diary*, perhaps the most valuable personal document we have from the end of the Elizabethan era? It is precisely Manningham's ordinary, orthodox, "grass-roots" perspective that makes his observations so important: in them, we are vividly reminded (among other things) how compact and interrelated the Elizabethan establishment was, wherein a young man from the country with no special connections could know from a friend's first-hand account how Gloriana languished and died, and could know, when it was still worth knowing, gossip about the new King, Lord Francis Bacon, Sir Walter Raleigh, the Earl of Sussex, John Donne . . . . A mathematician has estimated that any individual is no more than five or six "mutual friendships" away from any other individual, anywhere in America; in the case of Manningham's *Diary*, one gets the impression that in the world of Elizabeth's England, the mutual friendship factor is more like *two*.

If the notorious John Payne Collier had not discovered the *Diary* in the British Museum and established its importance in his *Annals of the Stage* (1831), one wonders if scholars would not have been forced to invent it, as the saying goes. Indeed, one small defect in Robert P. Sorlien's sumptuous new edition — the first complete printing of Manningham's text — is that he does not take up and dispel for good the lingering suspicion amongst some scholars that the notorious Collier

himself fabricated whole sections of the *Diary*, to make, as was his wont, a nearly perfect Elizabethan "example" even better. But the available evidence, both internal and external, supports the assumption that the work is authentic.¹

Before the appearance of Sorlien's edition, the only full access to Manningham was through the Camden Society text edited by John Bruce in 1868. Unfortunately, Bruce saw fit to omit some 54 passages, most of them on the grounds of indecency — "the slough of a coarser generation, which our ancestors had not then entirely cast off."² It must have cost Bruce some anxiety, then, to include Manningham's delicious anecdote about Shakespeare as a wenching "William the Conqueror," but the story was already so well known that he could not omit it — although in truth it is no less risqué than most of those he does omit. In 1974 I published a restoration of most of Bruce's expurgations, along with a general examination of the literary and cultural significance of the *Diary*, and for the first time such items as this sketch of Manningham's fellow-Templar Sir John Davies became available—

J. Davys goes waddling with his arse out behynd as though he were about to make every one that he meets a wall to pisse against./B. Rudyard, Th. Overbury/ He never walks but he carries a cloke bag behind him, his arse sticks out so farr.³

Now, Sorlien has given us all of Manningham that we are likely to get — a complete text, re-transcribed from the manuscript, corrected, and unexpurgated; a very full set of textual notes and identifications; a biography of the Diarist; and a set of appendices, including the text of his will (he died in 1622) and that of his great-uncle and benefactor Richard Manningham of Bradbourne. It is, all things considered, a masterful edition, a triumph of scholarship's craft and art: now at last the full range of the significance of Manningham's little book can be properly assessed, by students of Elizabethan poetry, drama, and pulpit literature, political and cultural history, sixteenth-century etymology and linguistics, and so on. (In addition, one wishes that Virginia Woolf could have sampled Manningham in this edition, and added him to her wonderful gallery of representative Elizabethans in *The Common Reader*. For assuredly he is, in his undistinguished way, representative, a good counterpoise to outrageously romantic figures like Sir John Davies, and to the Elizabethan stereotypes that have grown out of figures like him.)

Sorlien's "Introduction" and his biography of Manningham are both excellent, clearly locating the major dimensions of the *Diary*'s value, and accurately summarizing the social and intellectual contexts in which the Diarist moved, in London and in the country. Thus we get a full and revealing picture, drawn in part from recent work by Philip Finkelpearl and others, of the Inns of Court at the turn of the century, part legal university, part club, part colony for freethinkers and highlivers: Sorlien's emphasis, on behalf of his basically sober Diarist, on the serious professional aspects of Inns of Court Life, is salutary.

Sorlien's astute grasp of the circumstantial network of Elizabethan professional life carries over into his voluminous notes, for the most part, especially in regard to the identities of lawyers, politicians, and divines, as alluded to in passing by Manningham. The editorial recovery of so much information, as caught in the *Diary*'s casual grid, is remarkable; it is here, as well as in the *Diary* itself, that the edition should prove to be indispensable for anyone doing scholarship in the period 1590-

1610. One example will have to suffice. In February 1602/3 Manningham noted, not without a leer, that "One told Toplife that he would tell him of papist[s] that frequented masse, and would bring him where he should take them At it; but he brought him where he took a gent [leman] in bed with his Daughter At it (Ch. Davers)" (p. 186). Bruce of course excized the entry; in restoring it, Sorlien adds two paragraphs of notes identifying "Toplife" as Richard Topcliffe (1532-1604), an Admiralty judge who became a much-hated specialist in spying out, torturing, and arraigning Catholics; he played a major role, for example, in the hunting down and martyrdom of Father Robert Southwell; to "topclifferize" became a synonym for "to hunt a recusant or to inform." In 1597, Sorlien adds, Topcliffe served on the Privy Council commission which dealt with Thomas Nashe's and Ben Jonson's play *The Isle of Dogs* and ordered their imprisonment on charges of sedition and slander (pp. 378-9). Such a note — and there are scores of them here — sheds light beyond the particular textual obscurity at which it is aimed.

There is a certain inconsistency in Sorlien's system of annotations; one would gladly trade the second and third paragraphs of his notes on some items, for some commentary on others which he has left unannotated. For example, Manningham entered the following — "All our new corne comes out of old fields, and all our newe learning is gathered out of old bookes" (p. 41) and attributed it to "Chaucer." Sorlien ignores the matter, although there is surely some annotative interest in Manningham's paraphrasing of what appears to be the fourth stanza of *The Parliament of Fowls*:

For out of olde felde, as men sayeth,
Cometh al this newe corn from yer to yere,
And out of olde bokes, in good feyth,
Cometh al this new science that men lere.⁴

Likewise, in October 1602, the Diarist offers an apparently eyewitness account of that year's Mayoralty Inaugural, with speeches by the Lord Chief Baron and the Lord Treasurer (Sir Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst — the poet), the latter urging that "there might some monthely strict searche be made in the Cytie for idle persons and maisterles men, whereof there were, as he said, at this tyme 30,000 in London; these ought to be found out and well punished, for they are the very scumme of England, and the sinke of iniquitie. . . ." (p. 113) One would expect some editorial commentary on the Lord Treasurer's concern over London's vagrant population — his figure is remarkably high, by most historical estimates — but there is no discussion, alas. And when Manningham observes on a visit to Kent that his great-uncle Richard recited most of the first two books of the *Aeneid* verbatim (p. 203), a gloss of some sort seems in order, perhaps relating the elder Manningham's mnemonic feat to his protégé's own ability to record (by memory alone? by shorthand?) the outlines of whole sermons, sometimes two per Sabbath.

Sorlien is generally very thorough when he sets out to identify the scores of preachers Manningham listened to, at St. Paul's, St. Clement's, Blackfriars, and elsewhere (including a select group who would soon begin work on the "Authorised Version" of the Bible), but he does leave a number unaccounted for, despite the availability of leads and clues. At the beginning of this review, I mentioned Robert

Wakeman's sermon at Paul's on Jonah; in Sorlien's text he remains merely "one of Baliol collodge in Oxeford" (p. 71), and although Wakeman eventually published the text of his sermon (to which the *Diary* devotes two pages of summary and quotation), mentioning the cloudburst that interrupted his preaching and sent Manningham scurrying, Sorlien does not recognize the fact, or pursue the possibility of comparing Manningham's sermon-notes and published texts of the same sermons, by Wakeman and others. Such comparisons can, I think, enhance our understanding of how preachers performed and how Elizabethans listened — important issues in an age so centered on what can be called "the auditory imagination" — and it is too bad, given his general scholarly investment, that Sorlien does not undertake such study. (For a discussion of Wakeman's text and Manningham's synopsis, see my article on Manningham, already referred to above.⁵)

But if these are limitations and shortcomings in the edition, it is a happy fact of the scholarly enterprise that they are of the kind that can and will be corrected by other scholars; what is important is that, through Sorlien's labors, we now have a complete, faithful, and accountable text of John Manningham's *Diary* to work with. Whimsy might ask what John Manningham, A.B., Utter Barrister, Attorney of the Court of Wards, would think about his unlikely immortality, now so handsomely consolidated — what is beyond whimsy is that all of us who traffic in Shakespeare's age have cause to be grateful for this definitive edition of his obscure contemporary's invaluable journal.

JAROLD RAMSEY, *The University of Rochester*

Michael Shapiro. *Children of the Revels: The Boy Companies of Shakespeare's Time and Their Plays*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977. Pp. xviii, 313. \$15.00

After Michael Shapiro's series of very interesting articles on aspects of the Boys Companies, this full-length study is a little disappointing, possibly because it is trying to do two distinct things. On the one hand, it works well as a general survey, a background against which individual plays can be more properly understood and evaluated (p. 231); on the other, it is less successful in explicating Shapiro's theories about the "social context" (p. vii) of the companies; and there is insufficient continuity between the first four background chapters and the last two which categorize the plays.

The virtues of the study can be shown by beginning with the last two chapters, which offer a very useful recategorization of the kinds of play to be found in the Private Theatres' repertoires. Chapter 5 divides plays from the first period of the children's activity into four main types: (1) plays influenced by the quasidramatic forms of debate and pageant, (2) plays derived from Roman comedy, (3) plays about pathetic heroines, and (4) Lyly's unique form of love comedy. The debates, pageants, and Latin comedy fall mostly into the early Tudor period, the pathetic-heroine plays into the 1570's, and the love comedy into the 1580's, though Shapiro emphasizes that this is not a simple developmental process and that the categories overlap. The divisions are workmanlike and useful, but one may question Shapiro's emphases in two places. He seems to put too much weight on the "pathetic heroine" tradition, considering the sparse and mainly putative evidence for such plays in the