graphy and social history out of this single source. His material is undoubtedly interesting. His tables of life expectancy and so on would have been more valuable if they had been published a few years ago, before demography in England became the professional branch of historical research that it is now. St. Botolph's, Aldgate, was one of the poorer out of about ninety tiny parishes in the crowded capital; it provides a statistical sample that is woefully inadequate and not at all random, and apart from infant mortality there is no way of matching its births to its deaths. A poor quarter naturally contained a high proportion of transients, and the records reflect this fact without giving us any real power to measure it. The figures are not without value, but they are already on the point of becoming out of date.

We can still be grateful for the (comparative) wealth of detail. Most parish registers, when they even survive from this date, record the bare names of those baptized, married and buried; in these, a succession of unusually gossippy clerks (not, apparently, ministers) kept what was almost a journal of parish events – in fact, as Professor Forbes calls it, a chronicle. A “small-beer chronicle,” of course. Professor Forbes quotes extensively; there is no room for quotation here, and odd sentences could not do justice to the cumulative effect of all these ordinary happenings, petty excitements and family tragedies.

History is a hobby interest to Professor Forbes, and he makes some statements that are calculated to make a historian wince. I think he might have noticed that he has accepted about three widely differing estimates of the population of London for the same period. It is easier to excuse his mistaking a “pottle” (which is half a gallon) for a “bottle” (p. 28). A “swaddler” (p. 10) is certainly not a Methodist preacher (in 1600!), and a pursuivant is as likely to be a petty police officer as a herald. “Newhaven” (p. 125) is Le Havre in France. In Chapter 7, on “Care of the Indigent Sick,” he gives a traditional, folklore picture of the effects of the Dissolution of the Monasteries and of Tudor enclosures which can only be accepted nowadays with serious reservations. Absence from church (p. 30) was indeed taken to imply Roman Catholicism, but it was the absence, not the catholicism, that was punishable by law, and there was nothing illegal about burying catholics in the parish graveyard. One minor error is the direct result of treating this unique set of records as if they were typical: he states (p. 31) that keeping the records was the main duty of a parish clerk. In fact it was not his duty at all, but the minister's. The multifarious duties of a parish clerk need not concern us, but I may mention that it was the custom in London to employ much better educated men than elsewhere, usually musicians. If keeping the records *had* been their duty, other London parishes might have provided material as rich as this one. Our knowledge of life and death in Shakespeare's London might have been more securely based than Professor Forbes, for all his enthusiasm and industry, has been able to make it.

ELLIOT ROSE, *University of Toronto*

Patrick Cullen. *Spenser, Marvell and Renaissance Pastoral*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970. Pp. lx, 212. \$7.

The remarkable vitality and variety of pastoral is the focus of this intriguing book. It makes an important addition to the literature on the subject.

Professor Cullen's central concern is to isolate two different kinds of pastoral, to which he gives the names Mantuanesque and Arcadian. In orientation, the first of these is moralistic, dualistic, otherworldly, allowing no opening to the human potential for love or ambition, committed totally to the life of individual withdrawal and contemplation, and hence inimical to the city as the very emblem of corrupting worldliness. By contrast, the second is triadic (Professor Cullen does not use the word but he might have, since there are neo-Platonic influences at work here): it finds a middle ground between the Mantuanesque extremes of spirit and flesh, worldliness and holiness, and it seeks in more relaxed fashion to admit and regulate passion, to confer dignity upon the virtuous active life in the world, and to postulate, after the usual pastoral withdrawal, a return to the city as the proper sphere of human societal existence. The author leads his readers through these schematic distinctions in a crisp and authoritative introductory chapter, calling with ease and familiarity upon classical, French, Italian and Spanish pastoral models, and being wholly persuasive about it in the process.

The distinctions Cullen makes are useful and valid; when they are applied to the *Shepherdes Calender*, they support his contention that, far from being monolithic, rigid or static, pastoral is capable of embracing widely varied, even contradictory, intellectual positions and modes of experience. Indeed, the chief stress throughout the book is on the essential importance to pastoral of dialectic: phrases like "multiform ambivalence," "plurality of values," "the exploration and counterbalancing of attitudes, perspectives and experiences" keep the viewpoint constantly before us. Critics before Cullen have customarily sought to find a unified, single and exclusive pastoral perspective in the poem. He himself takes a course that is more attuned to the nature of the pastoral form, and which admits diversity of outlook for the sake of meaningful complexity. For example, he reveals the moral eclogues as attempts to explore a position rather than to come to a conclusion in which either one or the other of the debating shepherds is proven "wrong." As proponents of unyielding and extreme positions (Mantuanesque age versus Arcadian youth, for example), the rustic debaters with their total commitment and limited vision subject themselves constantly to an irony as penetrating as it is gentle. This kind of reading has two effects: it focusses attention on the comic aspects of the poem (the naive vanity of the shepherds provides an ironic distancing which qualifies their more extreme judgments) and, to my mind at least, it has the further effect of making the poem an altogether more *dramatic* thing than it has been previously considered.

An even more interesting dramatic touch is added by Cullen's analysis of the love theme in the eclogues, where Colin Clout figures finally as a self-absorbed neurotic who fails as both poet and lover and terminates as a "distortion of aged Mantuanesque wisdom" in loveless solitude. The analysis is compelling and it seems perfectly in keeping with what we have come to know of pastoral as a form that accommodates a whole spectrum of attitudes and counsels moderation in all things. (It also accords with what we know of Spenser's attitudes in *The Faerie Queene*, especially Book III.)

The fluidity of the genre is one of its most attractive assets, as it finds value now in contemplation, nature, simplicity and solitude, and now again in activity, art, complexity and society. The choice between the two can never be simple and Marvell's treatment of their inherent complexity is notorious. While the core of Professor Cullen's book is clearly in the two elaborate chapters devoted to Spenser, the slightly more than fifty pages devoted

to Marvell's complex simplicities are no less densely crammed with information. Briefly, the author finds the same awareness of these dual pastoral traditions in Marvell's lyrics, both the Christian lyrics and the amorous pastorals, among the last of which he classifies the Mower poems. Here again, he reveals a refreshing tendency to ignore the esoteric excesses of some contemporary analyses of Marvell and banishes to some really frightening footnotes his disagreements with their positions, which he paraphrases or quotes pretty fairly. There are some excellent and lucid pages on "The Garden" as a synthesis of many diverse Renaissance attitudes (think of the highly localized, partisan and embattled explications one has read in favor of Neoplatonism, Hermeticism, etc. and one appreciates Cullen's sanity all the more); and his reading of the Mower poems in terms of pastoral comic tradition and love psychology provides a needed counterbalance to the barrage of Eden-analogues to which we have been treated in recent years.

A caveat: unfortunately, in these later chapters, a tendency in Cullen's style which has peeped up earlier (pp. 37-8) now comes alarmingly and fully to the fore: the doing of an argument to death through battering insistence and hammering repetition (see especially pp. 175-6 and 193-5). The intensity of the explication, frequently unrelieved by humor, wit or levity, reflects more and more the impersonal and relentless style currently cultivated by the literary journals; nothing is suggested, everything is asserted, propounded. A pity; in an otherwise Arcadian production, it is one of the few Mantuanesque blemishes, other minor ones being misprints on pages 13, 26, 60 and 112.

PETER V. MARINELLI, *University of Toronto*

Norman Rabkin, ed. *Reinterpretations of Elizabethan Drama: Selected Papers from the English Institute*. Columbia University Press, 1969. Pp. x, 205. \$6.

This volume of essays illustrates the unhappily increasing tendency of contemporary criticism of Elizabethan drama to examine not Elizabethan plays themselves but criticisms (including theatrical performances) of the plays. This criticism of criticism can at best reveal personal and social biases in previous interpretations of dramatic works, and alert us to the possible biases in our own interpretations; but too often it becomes either a mere recitation of others' critical views or a psychological or sociological study instead of a literary or dramatic one. Nevertheless, more and more of it appears: perhaps inevitably, as the backlog of literary criticism grows and begs to be comprehensively ordered (as in Schoenbaum's remarkable *Shakespeare's Lives*), and as the social sciences increasingly envelop the humanities.

Here we have both the good and the bad. Jonas Barish leads off with an informative, perceptive commentary on the critical perspectives of Archer, Artaud, and Brecht, and points out that every age interprets the literature of the past according to its own preoccupations. This begs the question: is Elizabethan drama therefore necessarily, as Barish believes, super-chameleon-like, or are we the chameleons, we citizens of the variable mid-twentieth century? Max Bluestone next overwhelms us with citation of some 80 studies of *Doctor Faustus*, in a heavy, 56-page demonstration of the play's ambiguity. The essay, though painstaking, and bibliographically useful, comes to life only when Bluestone approaches the drama itself