been said was that Adam's punishment was to live a simple and laborious life in the wilderness, just as the first Carthusians had done. Likewise, the introduction includes a two-page paraphrase of Alberto's will, with a 45-line footnote occupying most of a third page, and the will then appears translated over a 16-page appendix, ornamented with 47 more footnotes: this will is not discussed by Erasmus. Hugh Trevor-Roper once said of *CWE* that its editorial apparatus was "economical but entirely sufficient." *Economical* is not the *mot juste* here. He also said, though, that the project as a whole was "a marvellous work of organization, erudition, and presentation ... a splendid enterprise," and that is certainly still absolutely true.

JOHN CONSIDINE, *University of Alberta*

Sophie Tomlinson. *Women on Stage in Stuart Drama*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Pp. xiv, 207.

The year 1660 is often identified as the point at which women began to perform publicly in English dramatic productions, and various reasons have been given for this milestone. Several critics have maintained that the rise of women on stage was likely a result of King Charles II's acceptance of female performers in European productions. In an important study, Katharine Maus has suggested the importance of seventeenth-century England's celebratory conflations of feminine sexuality and drama. Sophie Tomlinson notes these influential arguments but posits that the impulse underlying and explaining these dramatic shifts can actually be traced to masques presented decades earlier by the Stuart Queens Anna and Henrietta Maria. Tomlinson does not regard the 1660 emergence "of ... professional actress[es] as a decisive change from the past," but as a progression that was based on debates from as early as 1603. She suggests that it is no longer tenable for historians to maintain their "long-held assumption" that England's public theatre tradition was "exclusively male" until 1660. Additionally, she argues for a need to examine dramatic works further that are centered on and written by women, texts "in which female theatrical representation is at issue," arguing that for too long academic research has focused almost solely on the figure of the male cross-dressing actor.

Tomlinson examines the conditions that allowed women to perform female roles publicly on English stages. Her discussion of Stuart performance, including genres like court masque and closet drama leads to her convincing argument that seventeenth-century spaces for and understandings of performance were surprisingly diverse. Tomlinson goes farther than past studies, which have underplayed the wide variety of dramatic roles performed by women, and she connects female performance with changing notions of women's subjectivity. Stuart court culture enabled upper-class women to assume greater levels of influence by means of drama, as in the case of Queen Anna, consort to James I and VI, whose patronage of and participation in masques surely cannot be separated from political manoeuvring.

The female performances introduced by Queen Anna buttressed those developed by Charles I's consort, Queen Henrietta Maria. In a 1626 production of Racan's *Artenise*, the latter queen even introduced the habit of women cross-dressing to perform male roles. Earlier Renaissance closet dramas written by women (the works of Elizabeth Cary and Mary Sidney, for example) rely in part on a conscious distancing from public performance, yet seventeenth-century writers like Margaret Cavendish and Katherine Philips offer works that "display a knowledge of and affinity with theatrical culture." Tomlinson refuses to see Cavendish and Philips as representative of a defining shift between earlier private female authorship and the later Restoration theatre culture of Aphra Behn (which saw women in open competition with male writers). Instead, she places the germ for change in the earlier court masques of Queens Anna and Henrietta Maria. Indeed, Tomlinson argues that the masque activities of Queen Henrietta Maria, together with her attendances at public performances, worked to challenge the distancing of upper-class women from the English theatre profession as a whole.

Tomlinson offers detailed commentary on Ben Jonson's *The Masque of Blackness* and *The Masque of Beauty*, both pieces in which Queen Anna performed, which "encompass a view of women's theatricality as potentially disrupting ... masculine identity and authority." Samuel Daniel's *Tethys Festival* involved performances by Anna and all of her children; as such, it links her role in the masque with considerable levels of authority within the family. Elsewhere, she offers chapters devoted to masques, pastorals, comedies, and tragedies, with extended discussion of select plays such as Jonson's *The New Inn*. The ties between women acting and contemporary understandings of political manoeuvring, marital relations, and women's subjectivity are often clear; however, Tomlinson could have more carefully connected the representations of women in tragedies with women's social roles and a larger sense of the body politic. In her detailed discussion of John Ford's tragedies *Love's Sacrifice* and *The Broken Heart*, the links between tragedian roles and social roles are not nuanced, nor are they made as effectively, for example, as the connections between "an encroaching sexual realism in the English theatre" and women's roles in pastoral plays like *Tempe Restored* and *The Shepherds' Paradise*. Her analysis of Philips's work is strong, especially her discussion of *Horace*. Her study of Cavendish is lively and informative, although it relies too heavily on biography at times. When compared to the chapter detailing Cavendish's work, the relative dearth of biographical information for Philips is especially noticeable.

Tomlinson's arguments are admirably clear and her decision to focus her analysis on a small number of texts is successful. Her examination of court masques—and the active participation of Queens Anna and Henrietta Maria in these productions—allows for new readings of women's involvement in seventeenth-century drama and the theatre. While this tradition for women was still largely elitist, a point which should not be ignored, Stuart court masques can be partly credited with

strengthening women's involvement in English stage performance. This study is well researched and thought-provoking.

LAURA SCHECHTER, *University of Alberta*

Evelyn Welch. *Shopping in the Renaissance: Consumer Cultures in Italy, 1400–1600*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005. Pp. ix, 403.

This book represents an important opportunity lost. As one of the principal investigators in a multi-year research project on the material Renaissance and, arguably, the leading authority on Renaissance shopping and market practices, art historian Evelyn Welch was perfectly positioned to write the definitive work on Renaissance consumerism. She more than any other scholar working in the field today could situate the development of shopping in Renaissance Italy in the larger narrative of the rise of Western consumer culture, especially as it has been theorized by Richard Goldthwaite in his 1993 study *Wealth and the Demand for Art in Italy*. Instead, she has written a book which, while extremely rich in illustrative examples and valuable insights, fails to place consumerism in Renaissance Italy fully in a larger historical context.

Before turning to that issue, it is important to highlight what the book does accomplish. Adopting “the approach of a cultural historian” (8), Welch divides her examination into four sections entitled “Seeing Shopping,” “The Geography of Expenditure,” “Acquisition and Excitement,” and “Renaissance Consumers.” In the first, Welch identifies the ambivalence associated with the marketplace; it was a place of “fecundity, abundance and wealth,” but also “sensuality, dirt and disease” (23). As such, it required constant surveillance by governmental authorities, especially as shopping required trust on the part of both buyers and sellers. In the second section, on the geography of shopping, Welch considers the elements of time and place and shopping's impact on the urban landscape. She examines the daily and annual rhythms associated with trade, and notes that there was very little difference in the infrastructure of shops engaged in wholesale and retail trade. Furthermore, the distance maintained in most shops between buyers and goods forced “contact between shopkeeper and buyer” (160). Fairs, bidding, and gambling are the concerns of the third section in which Welch considers some of the other methods by which shopping was accomplished and the ways in which those with goods to sell generated both excitement and the desire to acquire them. Lotteries and auctions of debtors' goods again illustrate the ambivalence of consumption since they served as lessons, “in *fortuna* as well as in consumption” (209). Welch divides her analysis of Renaissance consumers along gender lines, illustrating how for both men and women, “shopping was a series of relationships rather than a simple exchange of money for material goods” (226). This was particularly so for someone like Isabella d'Este, the subject of Chapter Nine, for whom “shopping was an act of clientage” (262). In the conclusion