

the French Revolution. Grenby's broader study of conservative literary strategies might have intersected in interesting ways with Wood's gendered analysis, and Grenby's interest in the role of reviewers in consolidating, disseminating and controlling conservative ideas in the literary marketplace might have complicated Wood's exploration of the relationship between reviewers and women. *Modes of Discipline*, however, usefully contributes to current criticism on the Romantic novel on its own, and the background it provides on evangelical novels may also be of interest to Victorian scholars. It might be profitable to place the chapter on historical fiction in conversation with the work of genre theorists, that of Ina Ferris or Ian Duncan, for example.

Sharon Alker
University of British Columbia

Work Cited

Grenby, M. O. *The Anti-Jacobin Novel: British Conservatism and the French Revolution*. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Paul Whitfield White and Suzanne R. Westfall, eds.
Shakespeare and Theatrical Patronage in Early Modern England. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Pp. 326.

This book should more properly be called *Theatrical Patronage in Early Modern England and Shakespeare*. The big guy makes a central appearance in three out of the twelve essays and is pretty well absent thereafter. For the most part, the book charts the history and development of patronage practices in the theatrical culture of the early Tudor period to the Stuarts. A vast quantity of learning is crammed between its covers and the results are never less than fascinating. The subject of theatrical patronage is a growing area of study that incorporates a plethora of issues relating to the social life of early modern England including the ways in which the shift from a feudal exchange economy to a market-driven economy affected the drama and is perceptible in the practice of patronage in the period. Most students of the period have a rather simplistic view of patronage that this collection of essays goes a long way to correct, flesh out and clarify. The focus is on

Most students
of the period
have a rather
simplistic view
of patronage
that this collec-
tion of essays
goes a long way
to correct, flesh
out and clarify.

the discernible drift away from old-fashioned patronage of the company by a great man towards a conception of patronage in which the audience became recognized as the determining force of theatrical success or failure. The commercial interest that comes to attend dramatic production replaces the economy of gift exchange by which earlier patronage practice is marked. But, as this volume compellingly shows, there is much, much more. Being about patronage, however, it has more to tell us about patrons than the recipients of their complexly motivated largesse. The latter are the players and their companies who wait, hope, and depend on the aims and intentions and goodwill of, initially, the rich and powerful and, ultimately, the audience itself as primary patron. The practice has still not entirely died out. Alexander Leggatt reminds us that even today the box-office driven Stratford (Ontario) festival lists the Governor-General as its “Patron.” To fully appreciate the change, we might examine the letter from Leicester’s Servants written in 1571–72 (unearthed by Sally-Beth MacLean) that gives explicit shape to the nature of the relationship that once obtained between players and patron. The sycophancy, obsequiousness, and flattery of the letter are visible markers of the culture of dependency that obtained: the patron was the powerful figure who kept the players this side of a law that designated unpatronised players as vagabonds.

Two of the essays in the volume, while firmly grounded in historical evidence, deal directly with play texts, exploring the dramas for the light they shed on patronage. David Bevington and Milla Riggio discuss the entertainments and masques commissioned for both Tudor and Stuart royal weddings (specifically those of three of Henry VII’s children and that of James I’s daughter, Elizabeth, over a century later). In his portrayals of royal marriage in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *The Tempest*, Shakespeare presents patron, artist, and audience, and explores the roles of Philostrate and Prospero as they manage on the one hand, and manage and create on the other, royal wedding entertainments. These plays reveal the presence of an autonomous artist whose role has developed out of that of the mere “devisor” of the early sixteenth century entertainments, who was largely subsumed into those enterprises defined almost entirely by the patron. In a fitting coda to the book, Alexander Leggatt explores *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, where he brings Beaumont’s scripted audience into the forefront of a study of the shift away from the court and towards the paying public as the new patron of the theatre. The new dependency of the theatre on its paying public is satirized in the play, but it alludes, nevertheless, to the reality of change in the conceptualization of the patron and the consequent demystification of theatrical practice into

a new kind of contract whereby the citizen assumes control of a system formerly accepted as the prerogative of a single person of power. The essay deals deftly and authoritatively with the historical scholarship surrounding the subject and offers rare critical insight into aspects of the play touched by issues of patronage, both real and scripted.

David Bergeron is alert to the nuanced transformation of patronage from dependence on aristocratic benevolence to the realities of the market and its practice of book purchase by the reading public which rendered the aristocratic dedicatees less and less of a factor in the book's success. "In its simplest form," he writes, "purchase completes patronage." His essay, a painstaking dissection of the Epistle Dedicatory and the Address "To the great Variety of Readers" of the First Folio, places that historic volume on the patronage faultline between the old-fashioned patronage system and the new marketplace of book buying, made possible by the advent of printing. The reverential dedication of the folio to the titled and worthy Herbert brothers brilliantly finesses the contradiction, seeming to leave aristocratic patronage intact, while, by their use of the brothers' name, Heminge and Condell look forward to its success as a marketable commodity.

Unsurprisingly, the Privy Council looms large in these essays. Paul Whitfield White takes us through the labyrinthine relationships of members of the council, especially the Cobhams, and their interactions with the late Elizabethan theatre community, including, of course, the role of the Lord Chamberlain in the Oldcastle affair. White argues that the real matter of this incident is Shakespeare's discomfort with some extreme tendencies of Elizabethan Puritanism and represents a deliberate attempt to satirize the Elizabethan Cobhams themselves. He makes the case, as do others, for the increasing independence of an acting company which seemed willing to criticize its governing-class patrons. He gives the full text of a fascinating letter by Edward Jones to Cobham (the Lord Chamberlain); it is a proud, but careful, protest against public embarrassment at Cobham's hands, and shows Cobham's willingness to intervene, however obnoxiously and publicly, in order to assert his authority over court festivities.

Leeds Barroll concentrates on revelries, in many senses of the word, as the sites of contact of the rich and poor of the period. He reminds us that it was only in the 1570s that players were exempted from the disgrace of definitional lawlessness; that prior to the '70s plays were only one of many forms of court celebrations during formalized periods of revelry. The nobles came to function as patrons of theatrical endeavour as they had formerly in other fields of performance and artistic production. Securing the patronage of a Lord Chamberlain for the first time in the late 1580s

was transformational in the evolution of players from near and actual vagabonds into professionals.

Alexandra F. Johnston takes us back to medieval York and that city's sponsorship of the Corpus Christi cycle drama that formed the basis of the relationship of patron—in this case the city itself—and players. Then, as later, the issue of social control was paramount in the minds of the civic authorities and the sponsorship, then, as later, was conditional. The pageants were not so much a matter of public convenience as a means of ensuring political and religious conformity and order. Johnston shows the active presence of the city fathers protecting themselves from the potential subversion of the festival and also their willingness to use the festival and plays to advance the old religion while resisting the pressure from the south of the forces of reformation. In 1569, she reminds us, the York Corpus Christi Play was performed for the last time in the period.

Mary A. Blackstone offers a social anthropological analysis of the power struggles in the reign of Queen Mary between the communities and the monarch bent on returning her subjects to the true religion. Opposition came in the form of entertainments consolidated within “neighbourhoods” of interest in the towns as they attempted to re-establish themselves in their own formations. Predictably, the monarch responded to such subversiveness with prohibitions, which, in turn were resisted. The essay argues for the existence of unexpected power amongst the poorer subjects, localized in the circulating systems of knowledge and power. The centre and the extent of these “neighbourhoods” was spatial, described by the geographical patterns traced by the performing tours of performers and players. They gave Queen Mary a suspicion of performers and playing, that suggested she fully recognized their subversive potential.

Andrew Gurr examines the role of the Privy Councilors as theatre patrons, attending especially to the role and function of the Lord Chamberlain. He explains some of the intricacies and complexities of a body made up somewhat arbitrarily, but whose members were usually related by blood or marriage, resulting often in bitter factionalism. The Earl of Leicester was a major figure in this circle, as was Charles Howard the second Lord Effingham, whom Gurr shows intriguing behind the scenes to ensure his control of theatrical entertainments presented to the Queen. Howard became lord of the admiralty, also a Privy Council post, and continued to wield and garner enormous power while leading a relatively unostentatious personal life. Gurr offers intriguing insights into the power dynamics forged out of the alliances and oppositions that characterized Council politics. The Lord Admiral and the Lord Chamberlain established

new companies in 1594, granting themselves monopolistic power over the theatrical activity of the city by licensing playhouses and establishing themselves as patrons of rival theatrical companies.

Sally-Beth MacLean examines the career as patron of Robert Dudley, the Earl of Leicester, and the fortunes and missteps of his career in this and other roles. His effectiveness as a patron of his own company, while he was in favour, made his players into the most widely traveled and experienced troupe in the land. And little wonder. Dudley seems to have been one of the ablest power-brokers of his day. His troupe was better remunerated when on tour than other troupes simply, it seems, because they bore his livery. He was a man of respect whose good opinion was courted throughout large parts of England and on the continent.

Focussing on the patronage of the companies of boy actors, Michael Shapiro traces a story of decline and extinction. He sees the earliest examples of patronage in this period as forms of gift exchange within a hierarchical culture in which the lines of patronage and reciprocity are clearly delineated. Commercialization and professionalization of the theatre caused the line to blur to the great detriment of the boys' companies. The professional actors policed themselves by almost all becoming equal sharers of revenue. The children's companies were far more susceptible to exploitation by their masters and never participated in the commodification process with the same effect. They were in the hands of masters and managers who were often impelled to profit at the expense of their child players and thus slowly fell into decline. Their attempt to become commercialized did not succeed. As Shapiro says: "Despite the growing tendency towards commercialism, the children's troupes began and ended as part of a system of patronage, which was itself changing."

The first essay in the book is its most complex and wide ranging. Suzanne Westfall theorizes patronage theatre by presenting it as a multi-dimensional cultural structure best explored in anthropological terms. Its complexity resides in its layered levels of production and realization. The interdependence and complementarity of theatrical production and patronage results in a product that is inherently complex. By drawing on contemporary literary theory Westfall attempts to dissect a class-based ethical and commercial structure of value to discover its context in the world that produced it and the world that inherited it as the ostensible inspiration of what we now warily regard as classic literary texts. She goes deeply into the literary historicists and the literary new historicists, and notes the use of databases, indexes, lists and letters in the matter of contextualizing the topic. Patronage was a way of life, she reminds us, going

well beyond the merely literary, into the closest corners of government and also into the most public and visible. She invokes Louis Althusser's idea of the Ideological State Apparatus to explain some of the ways in which the state legitimates its use of power and control, and lets us see that the theatre has often been co-opted into the enterprise, though she argues that Althusser's vision is too monolithic to be applied to the early modern English period which resembles it, but which repeats the resemblance within itself too many times to be regarded as a fully functioning example of that hegemonic model. Anthropology and its sense of societies as complex systems of binding relationships, often benignly achieved, provides a usable source of theory for the understanding of the system explored in this book. Westfall's is a thoughtful, clear, balanced and nuanced essay. It is a fitting prologue to this immensely rewarding and rich study.

Derek Cohen
York University

Marshall Brown, ed. *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism. Vol. 5: Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000. Pp. 493. U.S. \$100.00 cloth.

The *Romanticism* volume in the *Cambridge History of Literary Criticism* series is a substantial resource for scholars and students interested in the history of ideas about literature, aesthetics, rhetoric, language, hermeneutics, communication, authorship and readership. It features sixteen distinguished contributors whose deeply learned essays strike a fine balance between individual perspective and large-scale survey of the field. The stated aim of the book is to represent the range of critical writing from the period 1780–1830 in a thematically-oriented manner. As editor Marshall Brown writes in the Introduction,

We preferred to let our chapters model how Romantics thought through and debated larger issues. The chapters are real essays, informational in their base, but ultimately more concerned with showing how Romantic ideas work and how