s a useful guide for the undergraduate who is studying the poem for the first time. The discussion is well written, explanations are clearly presented, and examples copiously recorded. With respect to one important matter, however, Crump introduces an unnecessary difficulty. In discussing the Exaltation of the Son in Book V as the beginning of the chronological action, Crump sometimes refers to it as the “Elevation,” which is all right, and sometimes as the “Creation,” which is not. On one page (164), he not only uses both terms, but adds to the confusion by quoting a passage from an essay by Lawrence Stapleton where he expression “the generation of the Logos” appears. Crump may indeed be aware of the differences between “Exaltation,” “Creation” and “generation,” but his book gives no evidence that he is. Furthermore, he does not take into account Maurice Kelley’s rejection in *This Great Argument* of Denis Saurat’s erroneous interpretation of “begot” in V.603, or A. S. P. Woodhouse’s similar argument in *The Heavenly Muse*, to mention only two places where the Exaltation-Creation matter is dealt with.

While adding nothing to Milton scholarship, *The Mystical Design of “Paradise Lost”* is nonetheless a helpful book for the student beginning a study of certain aspects of Milton’s great epic.

HENRY D. JANZEN, University of Windsor

___


One of the few seventeenth-century English communities that the present-day researcher has an opportunity to know intimately is the parish of Myddle in Shropshire. About the beginning of the eighteenth century one of its inhabitants, a yeoman called Richard Gough, wrote a history of the parish in which he included not only detailed descriptions of the ups and downs of the local families but biographies and character sketches of many of their members. What Anthony Wood did for the lives of so many Englishmen of national importance in his time, his contemporary Gough did for the obscure countryfolk of Myddle. Gough, like Wood, had a pungent style and an eye for vivid detail, and his history is full of pen portraits like this one: “William Tyler lived to a very great age; and when he had wasted most of his Estate, hee came backe to Balderton, and lived in the old house, which was then made use of for a bakehouse. Hee had a litle flocke of sheep, which hee kept on the commons: his employment was to walke among his sheep, with a shepherd’s crooke in his hand, and if hee saw a fat wether of his neighbour’s, hee would catch him with his crooke, and carry him home and slauter him for himselfe. Hee had beene accused to stealing all his lifetime, and could not forbeare in his old age” (Human Nature displayed in the History of Myddle [rpt. Fontwell, Sussex, 1968], p.112).

David Hey has had the excellent idea of combining Gough’s record of life in Myddle with the other, more standard records of this parish to produce a study in depth of “all the aspects of this rural community for a period of about six generations, between 1524 and 1701” (p. 2). The result is thorough, sensible, and scholarly, and a further example, which we already have many, of the exceedingly high level of scholarship applied to local history in England. At the same time, unfortunately, it is likely to prove disappoint-
ing to readers who are interested in seventeenth-century English life on a broad scale rather than in Shropshire in particular. For all its workmanlike merits, its wider importance is chiefly that of the "contribution"—the scholarly work whose value is in fitting together with other works to provide a more significant picture of a subject (in this case, the conditions of life of ordinary people in seventeenth-century England) than it contains itself. As a piece of the jigsaw puzzle, it takes its place with such scholarly works as Peter Laslett and John Harrison's "Clayworth and Cogenhoe" in Historical Essays 1600-1750 Presented to David Ogg and Alan Macfarlane's lively study, The Family Life of Ralph Josselin.

The fact seems to be that Myddle itself has betrayed Dr. Hey. Though Gough made literary gold out of his observations there—his first edition was very aptly given the title by its editor of Human Nature displayed in the History of Middle—yet when we are removed from the sort of face-to-face observation that was possible for Gough, Myddle seems rather dull. The Reformation and Civil War passed over it, creating few ripples, and little else of importance happened there in the period Dr. Hey covers; and the absence from the parish of a dominating squire or nobleman left the social structure relatively informal and free of tension. The local vice—much noted by Gough—was that age-old solace of boredom: drink.

There is, however, an interesting problem concerning Myddle which Dr. Hey touches upon but does not discuss in detail, as not being within his defined period. This is the problem of how this stable, quiet, and on the whole not unprosperous community broke up in the eighteenth century when it was "destroyed by engrossing as effectively as the east Midland peasant communities were destroyed by enclosure. The small farmers were driven out, and a new society, more sharply divided between the rich and the poor, arose out of the old. Richard Gough died in 1723 on the eve of these changes, and his unique book describes a traditional way of life that was soon to be destroyed" (pp. 230-31). Perhaps Dr. Hey will write an essay on this transformation. A question that has interested at least the present transatlantic reviewer is whether any of the families described by Gough still live in Myddle. Dr. Hey has worked out the genealogies of many of these families by piecing together details laboriously from Gough, parish registers, manorial documents, and the like, but he never records any of them as living in Myddle later than the nineteenth century.

ROYCE MacGILLIVRAY, University of Waterloo


This most recent volume in the distinguished Harvard Historical Series reminds the reader of the sad truth that history is usually written by victors. The victor recognized here is the Council of Trent whose influence in ecumenical affairs has been so overwhelming that few but specialist historians know much about the subject of Dr. Nugent's book, the Colloquy at Poissy. It met from July to October, 1561, just prior to the opening of the last session of the Council of Trent on January 18, 1562. We should all be grateful to Donald Nugent for this thoughtful appraisal of Poissy's attempt to provide an ecumenical alternative to