of *energia*, which Rudenstine reads as a dramatic energy of style, transmitted especially by direct address, personification, prosopopeia and other animating techniques. Robinson insists that it must instead mean "conceptual clarity," but finds himself illustrating again and again, especially in *Astrophil and Stella*, the very dramatic devices he would demote as irrelevant. One is forced to conclude that Sidney meant what he said when he defined *energia* as "forcibleness," and regretted its absence in the love sonnets of his contemporaries.

Despite these objections, or indeed because of them, the book is well worth the effort of careful reading, providing the intellectual stimulus of necessary wariness which safer studies deny one, and constantly cancelling out one's uneasiness over details by summaries and conclusions as wisely latitudinarian as Sidney's own.

ANNABEL PATTERSON, *York University*

Gerald Eades Bentley. *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time, 1590-1642*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1971. Pp. ix, 329. \$10.

In an earlier book entitled *Shakespeare and His Theatre*, G. E. Bentley speculated that we might achieve more schematic understanding of Renaissance dramatic practices by distinguishing among "amateur," "occasional," and "fully professional" playwrights.¹ His present work arrives at these divisions. Of two-hundred fifty authors who wrote plays during the Elizabethan, Jacobean, and Caroline periods, Professor Bentley distinguishes twenty-two playwrights who served the commercial theatre primarily, and from this group isolates a smaller number of "attached" or "professional" dramatists: Heywood, Fletcher, Dekker, Massinger, Shakespeare, Shirley, William Rowley, and Brome. *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time* uses the known practices of these playwrights to standardize the professional theatrical attitudes and activities of writers for the London stage: attached professionals, it argues, commonly assume that the writing, editing, revising, and publishing of their work must frequently be a company, and thus a communal, responsibility; they see their plays as theatrical, not literary, efforts; their work shows special regard for the requirements of theatrical performance.

By "professional dramatist," Professor Bentley means specifically those men who had continuous association with one London theatre or another, who showed hesitation about seeing their plays through the printing process, and whose play production was consistent and regular. Most important, the professionals were "primarily dependent upon the theatres for their livelihood."² Income from other than theatrical sources or eclectic compositional habits exclude from the professional category many of the most influential Renaissance dramatists: Jonson, Marston, Webster, Chapman, and Ford.

Professor Bentley's categories are less arbitrary in practice than they appear in summary. And they are documented with exhaustive conscientiousness. That the acting companies imposed publishing restrictions on their attached playwrights is evidenced by the 1635 and 1638 contracts drawn up between Richard Brome and the players of the Salisbury Court theatre; similar restrictions are implied by the publishing records of other attached professionals. The negative attitudes of amateur playwrights toward their professional contemporaries illustrate the low social status of attached dramatists. On the other hand, pay-

ment records from Henslowe's diary indicate the economic rewards of writing for the commercial theatres. The sequence of Henslowe's payments for specific plays further suggests general compositional habits and collaborative practices, at least for writers attached to his companies,³ during the years 1597-1602.

Unfortunately for those of us with literary bias, Professor Bentley's interests rarely lead him to derive evidence from the internal idiosyncracies of literary or dramatic texts. The book's documentation comes almost exclusively from contemporary accounts of theatrical affairs, most of which are familiar and available elsewhere.⁴

We know that prolonged association with the public stage frequently created a marked disparity between an Elizabethan playwright's economic and his social status. Shakespeare's sonnet 111 focuses on the emotional burdens attending such a separation of fundamental value structures:

O, for my sake do you with Fortune chide,
The guilty goddess of my harmful deeds,
That did not better for my life provide,
Than public means which public manners breeds.
Thence comes it that my name receives a brand,
And almost thence my nature is subdued
To what it works in, like the dyer's hand.

This sonnet is the more extraordinary if we recall that it was composed when the author had long been an actor, playwright, and shareholder in the most economically successful theatrical enterprise of Renaissance England.

Rather than being affirmed by the popular success of his art, Shakespeare almost finds himself subsumed *in* it, and is disturbed by the absence of clear boundaries to distinguish his personal and private from his professional and public roles. Here he laments the necessity of diffusing his personal experience into public statement, and further implies that economic reward is scarcely worth the anxiety created by what he takes to be public notoriety and psychological exposure.

Shakespeare's assumption that attachment to the professional theatres was somehow demeaning is not unique. Professor Bentley demonstrates that amateur Renaissance playwrights habitually dissociated their works from those prepared for commercial performance; often their disclaimers reflect strong cultural prejudice against the public stage. Shakespeare's sonnet thus sustains scholarly conclusions about the status of attached playwrights. It also invites us to expand our understanding of what we consider to be "significant" aspects of "the normal working environment circumscribing the activities" of the professional dramatist.⁵

STEPHEN LACEY, *University of California, Santa Barbara*

Notes

1 G. E. Bentley, *Shakespeare and His Theatre* (University of Nebraska Press, 1964), p.23.

2 G. E. Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time* (Princeton University Press, 1971), p.30.

3 Bentley is weaker when he extends these conclusions to companies for whom no such records exist: in the case of writers for the King's Men, he is tangential on the problems surrounding the Beaumont,

- Fletcher, and Massinger collaborations, and unnecessarily vague about both Shirley and Shakespeare.
- 4 The book is particularly indebted to J. Q. Adams, ed., *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*; R. A. Foakes and R. T. Rickert, eds., *Henslowe's Diary*; Ann Haaker, "The Plague, the Theatre, and the Poet," *Renaissance Drama* n. s. I (1968), 283-306.
- 5 Bentley, *The Profession of Dramatist in Shakespeare's Time*, p. vii.

Frederick Hartt. *History of Italian Renaissance Art*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. and Harry N. Abrams, N.Y., 1969. Pp. x, 636.

This is a monumental work of scholarship by one of the greatest of the modern American historians of Italian art. It is, in the author's intention, addressed primarily to the students attending his art-history course at the University of Virginia. These students should (and I am sure they do) consider themselves fortunate to have such a mentor, a mentor who pays them the compliment of assuming that they are fully capable of the effort required to assimilate the occasionally difficult technical language of the arts. To an intimate grasp of the enormous materials of his specialty (a grasp which is the result of the "autoptic" inspection of each one of the art-works examined), Professor Hartt unites a complete knowledge of their backgrounds (political, religious, social, economic).

Professor Hartt excels in discriminating the strands of complex historical situations and in describing in concise but substantial outlines the peculiar originality of the various artists. Aesthetic enthusiasm predominates, but a sober, constantly well-balanced judgment controls that enthusiasm in matters stylistic and in the appraisal of the interrelationships prevalent between artists and between trends of artistic creation.

Professor Hartt feels – and there is, I think, thorough justification for this feeling – that in a period like the Renaissance, characterized by the versatility of its major figures, the main *arti del disegno* (as Vasari calls them), i.e., painting, sculpture, architecture, should be treated together, so as to compose a historical *tableau* where not only each one of those arts receives its due, but where they are shown (and sometimes in a very unexpected and astonishing way) to be interdependent. As Professor Hartt underscores, while there is no scarcity of English histories of Italian Renaissance painting, or sculpture, there has existed up to now no volume dealing with all three of them. This gap he undertakes to fill, and with results which attest to his mastery and to his penetrating insights into, at times, unexplored associations. Nor does he ever lose sight of the relations which obtain between Italy itself (the land, agriculture, types of population, climatic conditions, regional differences, etc.) and the art produced in that country; thus he gives concrete and brilliant confirmation of Goethe's dictum that whoever "wishes to understand the poet [i.e., the artist] should betake himself to the poet's native land." Nor can any critic, however carping, dispute the rightness of Professor Hartt's decision to treat at length revolutionary figures and major movements "rather than to include certain minor masters, no matter how delightful their works may be" (*Foreword*). He admits to a Tuscan (or rather to a Florentine) bias which (he says with a charmingly humorous smile) he "would be willing to relinquish if it could be proved that the Renaissance originated anywhere else" (*Foreword*). He is defending himself against the same criticism formulated against Vasari when he remarks that, despite his Tuscan bias, he has tried to be fair to other Italian *Kunstlandschaften*, but may be