rhétorique dans la poésie de la Renaissance qu'écrire: "ce qui sauve justement ces églogues amoureuses, c'est que malgré les images traditionnelles, on y trouve parfois la fraîcheur d'un paysage réel et l'expression sans prétention de sentiments peu compliqués" (p. xxiii). La somme des emprunts relevés par M. Gautier lui-même témoigne assez du contraire, et la simplicité qu'il invoque est précisément l'une des conventions du genre bucolique.

La seule utilité de cette édition, et elle ne prétend sans doute à rien d'autre, sera de rendre accessible un exemple de la production poétique moyenne sur la banalité de laquelle, à la Renaissance comme aux autres époques, se détachent les grandes oeuvres. Elle intéressera donc les historiens de la littérature, et eux seuls.

ROBERT MÉLANÇON, *Université de Montréal*

David Kaula. *Shakespeare and the Archpriest Controversy: A Study of Some New Sources*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1975. Pp. 132. \$15.00

Anyone claiming to offer "a set of new sources" for *Hamlet*, *Troilus and Cressida*, *Othello*, *Measure for Measure*, *King Lear* and *Macbeth*—unless he has discovered a buried strong-box, a lost play, or Anne Hathaway's laundry list—has little to show, and everything to prove. Professor Kaula's analysis of seven politico-religious pamphlets written between 1601 and 1602, and of their relationship with six of Shakespeare's plays (1601-6), is an intriguing speculation supported by an extensive amount of historical scholarship. But ultimately there is no proof in Professor Kaula's thesis that Shakespeare knew of and read these tracts, or that he consciously or unconsciously infused his plays with their "verbal detail," "thought, situation and character."

The Archpriest Controversy was a "complicated set of disputes certain features of which still remain obscure." Essentially, it involved two factions within the Catholic Church: the "seculars"—priests representative of traditional ecclesiastical order surviving from pre-Reformation times, and the "Jesuits"—those "dangerous," "conspiratorial" champions of the Counter-Reformation. In an attempt to impose some kind of order on the divergent elements in the priesthood at the end of the sixteenth century, the Cardinal Protector of England in Rome appointed a secular priest as Archpriest with jurisdiction over all the clergy in England. But far from having authority over the Jesuits, he was directed to consult the Jesuit Provincial, presumably, now, his Superior. When the subsequent uproar by the seculars was reprimanded by Pope Clement VIII

as schismatic, "a dozen or so" individuals began "to wage a vigorous polemical campaign" against the Archpriest and the Jesuits. The resulting "pamphlet war" produced eighteen anti-Jesuit tracts over a period of eighteen months in 1601-2. Ironically, these pamphlets were printed at well-established London presses, one in fact by the official printer to the Queen, revealing the Crown's vested interest in a divided Catholic clergy.

The Archpriest Controversy does not maintain any of the significance or excitement of Essex's rebellion or the Gunpowder Plot, but it does offer another interesting historical anecdote concurrent with a period of Shakespeare's career in London. Though Professor Kaula presents a well-argued case that Shakespeare could have been familiar with at least some of the pamphlets, Kaula is straining credibility when he declares that "it is possible to see a recurrent relationship between the plays and pamphlets similar to the one between other groups of Shakespeare's plays and sources he habitually turned to—the history plays and Holinshed's *Chronicles*, the Roman plays and North's *Plutarch*."

Much of Professor Kaula's study relies on a somewhat random analysis of word frequency and repetition between the pamphlets and plays. Since the plays contain no substantial passages from the pamphlets, and they "reveal no parallels," he admits that most of his examples are "rather of the smaller, scattered variety." Verbal echoes certainly have a place in any literary source study, but when Professor Kaula insists on a one-pamphlet-to-one-play source-relationship ("In no case is there a question first of one play, then of another, then of a third, as one would expect if the similarities were merely fortuitous."), I disagree. For example, the disease metaphor contained in one pamphlet surely evokes more plays than simply *Troilus and Cressida*; the "pervasive legalistic flavoring" of another pamphlet could be linked with plays other than *Othello*; the image of royal succession "wrested out of the hands" of a king is contained in several histories, as well as in *Macbeth*. In an attempt to bolster what often appears to be an accumulation of accidentals, Professor Kaula proposes many oblique connections between texts: "'topless deputation' [in *Troilus*] would be equivalent to 'Christes vicar' [in one pamphlet]" "Angelo's 'characts' would be equivalent to the Archpriest's 'seale'"; and "the phrase: '*too late you shall lament your incurable woe*' [in one pamphlet] is approximated fairly closely by Lear's line: 'Woe that too late repents.'"

For the most part I find the connections between these verbal echoes quite strained; the echoes themselves are not only contextually dissimilar but overly general and imprecise. Two brief examples: Professor Kaula lists twenty-two words in *Hamlet* which occur in no other Shakespearean play before or after, and which are also contained in one of the pam-

phlets. But this statistic appears rather limp next to Alfred Hart's thirty-four-year-old essay which reveals that there are 600 previously unused words in *Hamlet*, and 400 which do not recur in any later play. Professor Kaula's treatment of Shakespeare's use of the word "equivocation," from Jesuitical equivocation, neither is a fresh discovery nor is consistent with his statement of a one-pamphlet-one-play source-relationship. Equivocation is an important theme in *every* play examined in this book, and then some, a theme which originates less in the Archpriest Controversy than in the Garden of Eden, as Glynne Wickham says, with the Grand Equivocator.

Frankly I would rather have read a straight historical analysis of the Archpriest Controversy from Professor Kaula than have to stumble through the conditional "maybe's," "might be's" and "conceivabilities" to understand their dubious connection with Shakespeare's plays. More useful as well would have been an appendicized word-frequency list of the Archpriest pamphlets in conjunction with the Shakespeare Concordance. As the book stands, the "mutually reinforcing effect" of scattered verbal similarities simply cannot substantiate the author's claim for "a set of new sources."

RAYMOND C. SHADY, *University of Toronto*