when, having turned aside just a little from chronological order (for testimonies of Roman authors, edited now, and as it were, as a matter of good faith with the public, will be supplied immediately afterwards) we proceed to attach a portrait of the governance of the British commonwealth around the time of the coming of Caesar, together with the character of its princes and its philosophers.

A scholar capable of translating so badly should perhaps have thought twice before writing a book on a major neo-Latin author. Reid Barbour's work is too substantial to be dismissed out of hand, but in several respects it falls short of the standards of exact and learned scholarship.

JOHN CONSIDINE, University of Alberta

Marcy L. North. *The Anonymous Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2003. Pp. xi, 309.

Marcy L. North has chosen a subject that resonates with many current debates in early modern literature. She uses the concept of anonymity to investigate differences and continuities between Mediaeval and Renaissance concepts of authorship, to examine the construction of authorship through the material conventions of print, to illuminate aspects of religious controversies in early modern English printed texts, to describe authorship in coterie manuscript culture, and to establish whether Anon really was often a woman. An important part of her project is to stress the prevalence of anonymous authorship in Mediaeval as well as Renaissance texts, and thus to bring together two usually differentiated periods.

What she calls a "theoretical" introduction mercifully eschews a post-modern methodology which might take perverse delight in anonymous texts. Instead it reveals North's interest in the material culture of manuscript and print, building on recent interest in manuscripts and in the History of the Book. Thus there is a great deal of meticulous research here, as well as stimulating ideas. She is scathing about the modern preference for texts with a named author and sees this as a perpetuation of the intentional fallacy. She also deplores the survival of New Critical preconceptions about texts which ignore paratext and pre-text. This is a very healthy corrective to bring to the study of early modern texts, which, as she states, are often the product of "collaboration, compilation, and the communal production of literature." North employs the theories of Barthes and Foucault in her investigation of the nature of authorship. By revealing the author to be a "function," Foucault lays the ground for her study of anonymity, but it is difficult to see how Barthes' theory helps her thesis, apart from his reimagining of the anonymity of every text. North's book devotedly excavates early modern conditions of authorship and reads every text in a profoundly historicist manner, to which Barthes' theory of the eternal re-writing of the text is alien.

The first chapter begins with the question of why anonymous writing is adopted into the Mediaeval canon, whereas it is ignored in the Renaissance. Some critics attempt to individuate the anonymous Mediaeval author(s) by using terms such as the *Pearl* poet: some acknowledge communal authorship, but wrongly see this as an important difference between Mediaeval and Renaissance texts. North tries to dispel the narrative of “the nameless minstrel who fades away with the emergence of the self-conscious genius,” wishing to replace such naive conceptualisations with an acknowledgement that anonymity in the Mediaeval period could be a sophisticated authorial gesture, and she analyses Chaucer’s *House of Fame* to that end. Such a textual convention is capable of being imitated and interpreted by later periods, and she sees Renaissance authors borrowing from Mediaeval texts to fashion their own anonymity.

Early print conventions mediate anonymity and naming through the collaborative nature of the printing enterprise, in which printers, booksellers, patrons, dedicators, editors, compilers and compositors, as well as authors, take part. Every volume identifies a number of these contributors, but in the competing claims and disavowals of responsibility, authorship itself is sometimes neglected. North makes an analysis of anonymity as a print convention in its own right, with many close studies of page layout and typography in printed books. She points out that anonymity could be as marketable as the name of a popular author, and is anxious to emphasise that print did not necessarily fix concepts of authorship.

Anonymity can often be seen in the early modern period as a simple response to censorship, but North demonstrates that this is not necessarily the case. One chapter considers the Jewel-Harding controversy of the 1560s and 70s in which there are two different attitudes towards identification of the author: the Establishment author chooses to be anonymous, whereas his Catholic opponent identifies himself. She completes a fascinating study of the textual construction of the pseudonymous author Martin Marprelate, which ensured that the tracts would be read as “a daring and deliberate act of social authorship enabled by anonymity.”

Coterie culture, which, as North states, “made anonymity into an evocative symbol of elite value,” was always going to be a very important part of her project. She offers some useful conclusions: that there is no one pattern of attribution of authorship across manuscripts, that correct attributions were harder to come by than anonymous copies of texts, and that anonymity was often the cause, not a result, of a poem’s popularity in circulating. A particularly suggestive study is her work on spaces in manuscript texts—gaps, mysterious initials, the design of an acrostic—which are often used to designate anonymity. She quotes ciphers, anagrams, and in-jokes to show members of a coterie playing with the notion of anonymity to demonstrate their own superiority to those outside it. Again, she talks dismissively of “the modern obsession with attribution,” but of course, she would not have been able to provide these examples had not modern scholarship penetrated the anonymity of the coterie. In fact North draws on a great deal of such scholarship, and a study of attribution practices is an important part of this chapter. Her conclusions are supported by careful and detailed study

of the Arundel Harington manuscript, the *Liber Lilliat*, and the Dalhousie manuscripts.

North's final chapter, on women's authorship, shows convincingly that, pace Virginia Woolf, Anon was not usually a woman. She presents some very fruitful readings of anonymous verse that demonstrate the social predicament of early modern women writers. She suggests, uncontroversially, that authentic women's authorship may not be marked by gender at all. What is missing here is the examination of the opus of a recently identified woman author, perhaps Hester Pulter, who does not always choose an explicitly feminised voice in which to speak. This might provide some markers for woman's authorship which are not to be found in anonymous poetry in which, as Marcy North states, it is impossible to judge the gender of the writer.

In the end, establishing the identity of Anon, and therefore reducing the amount of suggestive and mysterious material she has to work with, is not in Marcy North's interest. It is, however, a paradox that a meaningful study of anonymity has to deal with its opposite—identification. This tension is found throughout this study, but it is a fruitful tension that produces many important insights into the nature of authorship in the early modern period, as well as some crucial frameworks for the reading of individual texts.

ELIZABETH CLARKE, University of Warwick

Jo Ann Cavallo. *The Romance Epics of Boiardo, Ariosto and Tasso: From Public Duty to Private Place*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004. Pp. 294.

Jo Ann Cavallo's book examines the development of the Italian chivalric romance tradition in its *durée*, from Matteo Maria Boiardo's *Orlando Innamorato* (1482; 1483 and 1495) and Cieco da Ferrara's *Il Mandriano* (1509) to Ludovico Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso* (in two extensively surveyed versions of 1516 and 1532), and *Cinque Canti* (composed 1519–21). Cavallo then moves to Giangiorio Trissino's *L'Italia liberata da' Goti* (1547–48), Bernardo Tasso's *L'Amadigi* (1560), and concludes with two works by Torquato Tasso, the youthful *Il Rinaldo* (1562) and *La Gerusalemme Liberata* (1581). This is a tall order, by any means.

Cavallo's intent, as she states briefly, is to examine how the genre of chivalric romance was used to foster an ideological program of education through literature, along the lines that humanists such as Guarino da Verona (in Ferrara 1429–60) were advocating. This means that writers of romances of chivalry are analyzed for the way they tried to form good individuals and honourable rulers through their poetic fictions. Cavallo repeatedly encourages us to read the actions of a knight intervening to bring justice in the larger context of his "role of a civic-minded reader." The notion that literature and history produce a civic sense informs Cavallo's interpretations of all the above-mentioned authors, the first of