that there were only (!) three Greek Psalters printed before 1500. As for the supposed fear of contamination of heresy implicit in Greek studies, one would suppose the same factor would have discouraged even more, though it did not, the study of Hebrew. Here Rabil is again misreading his source, this time W. Schwarz (*Principles and Problems of Biblical Translation*, p. 92f.). Schwarz makes his points—which are contestable in any case—specifically with reference to the early 16th century, not to the mediaeval period to which Rabil applies them.

Passing to matters less substantial, one must praise the editors for the very attractive presentation of this first monograph in their series. At the same time, Rabil's decision not to print a bibliography is regrettable; and the absence of a biblical index is a serious defect, as is his habit of citing Erasmus only by reference to the Leiden edition, without in most cases identifying the biblical passage under discussion. The abundant translations of the sources are a praiseworthy feature in an age when too few readers will be able to decipher the original; but in the notes one would prefer the Greek or Latin expression in question (e.g., p. 124, nn. 44, 46, 47, 49).

To conclude, although there are positive features to this study, its defects, together with its too frequent lack of originality, suggest that students would be better sent to the older studies Rabil himself has used.

R. GERALD HOBBS, *Institut d'Histoire de la Réformation, Genève*

Alexander Leggatt. *Citizen Comedy in the Age of Shakespeare*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973. Pp. 167. \$10.00.

I believe that in the judging (sometimes called "reviewing") of books of criticism on the works of particular authors, of books purporting to investigate literary genres, and of books which set out to survey literary "periods" there are two questions which the reviewer should ask himself: first, is the task which the critic (or literary historian) has set himself worth doing and, second, if so, is the task well done? Of Professor Leggatt's book I would say that the answer is "Yes" to both questions. I would like to give an unqualified "Yes" to both these questions, for the book is finely written (without academic jargon), finely researched, and it displays a vast knowledge of the drama, stage conditions, and society of the times. But another question arises: how much of it is true? Or, to put it in other words: how much with all our patient, scholarly research and our imaginative attempts to put ourselves back into "the age of Shakespeare" do we really gain in true confidence that we know the age and have a "feeling" for it? Professor Leggatt I believe is well aware of this critical bugbear, for on the opening page of his "Introduction" he comes out modestly to define "citizen comedy": "For this writer it means comedy set in a predominantly middle-class social milieu" (p. 3). But Professor Leggatt is sensitive enough to his subject to realize that such simple definitions are indeed too simple; so he considers the matter at more length in his "Introduction," coming forward, for example, with the following:

It is most convenient, then, to define the social milieu of citizen comedy by exclusion. I have selected plays which do not deal predominantly with the court or the aristocracy,

but with the fluid, often ill-defined area that lies between this and the lowest class of workmen, servants, rogues, and vagabonds.

I would suggest that the word "fluid" and the phrase "often ill-defined area" should be kept in mind in any consideration of the subject which our author has in hand. Having argued his point that there is such a thing as "citizen comedy," Professor Leggatt, indicating that he will confine himself to the period of 1585-1625 and that he will proceed in chronological order in his discussion—which I think is a wise decision—commences the main body of his book.

Having abandoned the historical, the "major authors," and the genre approaches to his subject, Professor Leggatt is left with what one could call the "thematic" approach. This judgment would seem to be borne out by a listing of the chapter headings, which as taken from the "Contents" are as follows: (2) Citizen hero and citizen villain (3) The Prodigal (4) The comedy of intrigue: money and land (5) Who wears the breeches (*sic*) (6) Chaste maids and whores (7) The comedy of intrigue: adultery. This kind of procedure could make for easy reviewing as far as content is concerned: all one need do would be to define the thematic approach and then to list the chapter headings. On the other hand, if one were to make an attempt to analyze the various chapters in any depth and to evaluate the judgments made on them, one would be faced with a great number of plays, comments on many characters, and with an author who brings to his subject a good knowledge of the social and economic background of the age.

The book has an excellent "Bibliography." It is clearly and attractively printed. Finally, one might note Professor Leggatt's unflagging industry in giving, as far as possible, the company and the date of the many plays that he brings into his discussion.

ALLISTER MacDONALD, *Acadia University*