

enormous and complex study in itself, and so admittedly difficult to treat fairly as background; but some basic review and reference could have been included here, with direction to further more specific research, and might have enlarged the discussion more explicitly. As well, I would like to have seen a more explicit engagement with theoretical models of reading, given the kind of ideas Narveson herself develops. At one point she makes a brief reference to Wolfgang Iser's concept of reading as performance, but beyond this she limits herself to period-relevant criticism only. The absence of reference to Stanley Fish and Roland Barthes stands out; Barthes in particular seems a blind spot, given his theorizing of authorship and writerly/readerly writing and reading. That being said, however, some may consider this a strength because the omission permits Narveson to concentrate on excavating and recovering manuscript sources, so again, the weakness I note here is relevant only for some. Overall, this is a sophisticated and engagingly lively discussion that ranges impressively through the primary and critical sources involved—perhaps more so than Narveson recognizes herself.

Derek Hirst and Steven N. Zwicker. *Andrew Marvell, Orphan of the Hurricane*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. xvi + 197 pp. \$99.00. Review by GEORGE KLAWITTER, HOLY CROSS COLLEGE.

For *Andrew Marvell, Orphan of the Hurricane*, Derek Hirst and Steven Zwicker have undertaken a difficult and, as they admit twice in their introduction, suspect construction or re-construction of Andrew Marvell's "imagined life." Since the poet left us few autobiographical comments, they contend readers are free to create for themselves the man-behind-the-poems as much as they can discern or think they can discern behind the lyrics and the prose (both letters and tracts).

For chapter one, they focus on "Upon Appleton House," and after Vitally Eyber's rather exhaustive 2010 analysis of the poem (*Upon Appleton House: An Analytic Commentary*) it is a wonder that Hirst and Zwicker could find anything fresh to say about that long poem, and they admit that the poem cannot be successfully explicated with any kind of finality. This opening chapter of *Orphan*, however, adds some

significant appreciations of the poem to an already mountainous pile of critical insights. Among the most daring ideas are the Hirst-Zwicker remarks on the curious absence of Lady Fairfax from the poem, she surfacing a scant four times (II. 299, 492, 724, 7424). The authors suggest that Lady Fairfax's reputation as a political embarrassment at the trial of Charles I, as well as her probable dalliance with Presbyterian causes, may have caused Marvell to minimize her presence in the poem, unless, and here the authors are most brave, Lady Fairfax appears in the poem as the lamentable and comic prioress who supervises the captivity of Isabel Thwaites. This is new ground to till and will delight graduate seminars for years to come. Having done their historical homework and backed up by solid documentation, the authors seem on safe ground. It is the highlight of a chapter marred only by some discursive pages on "The Garden" and "Bermudas."

But if chapter one shows only a few distracting sidelines to its major premise, chapter two is an absolute riot of insight, reference, and quotation. Paragraphs jump from poem to poem, buoyed by extensive footnoting, often with quick jabs at several poems within a single paragraph. This Hirst-Zwicker type of explication can exhaust a reader and distract from the chapter's main point: that Marvell was uncomfortable with heterosexuality and patriarchy. Some suggestions fly up with an air of brilliance only to dash themselves on unanswered questions. For example, the authors try to show that lines 241-6 in "Upon Appleton House," lines long assumed as referring to Fairfax, actually more appropriately refer to Cromwell so that the poet is actually undercutting the élan and respectability (patriarchy) of his host while supposedly praising him. The authors marshal little proof for this strange assertion other than to list three Cromwellian forays between 1648 and 1650 at a time when Fairfax was still nominally in charge of the rebel forces but was contemplating retirement. The density of interpretations and the sheer volume of repeated references to works are so thick, for example, during a consideration of Marvell's prose letter to Sir John Trott, "Little T.C.," and *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, as to leave a reader gasping for air.

Chapter three, however, does manage a rather fine cohesiveness by sticking to a close, extended reading of "The Unfortunate Lover," the poem which afforded the title for the Hirst-Zwicker book. The

authors examine the piece segment by segment, their explication for the most part satisfying and honest enough to admit that for most readers the poem is beyond comprehension. The second half of the chapter, however, is subject to the same blitzkrieg organization that confounded chapter two. An attempt to use “The Unfortunate Lover” as a base text to understand the entire Marvell corpus is an exercise in futility. The poem is too obscure to hope it useful for anything beyond itself.

One thing is certain about *Orphan*: it is not a book for new Marvelians. Appreciating the Hirst-Zwicker book requires a solid familiarity with the Marvell corpus, especially the poetry. The authors expect of their readers not just a knowledge of major poems (“Nymph,” “Horatian Ode”) but also of the minor poems and some of the prose. Theirs is a book of scholarly expectations, and their method may distance a significant portion of Renaissance readers. Stopping to re-familiarize oneself with, for example, “Daphnis and Chloe” can be an education surely, but stopping to reread minor poems does interrupt the flux of enjoyment one would get from sustained analysis of a single major text. One of the dangers of blitzkrieg referencing is that some insights passed off as gospel do not get the benefit of proof, either by extended explication or by documentation, for example, a sentence like “Coy engagement, as we have seen, may well be detected too in ‘The Garden,’ Marvell’s most famous rendering of ecstatic absorption within a green world” (154). What, we may ask, makes this poem the “most famous”? And what about “ecstatic absorption” in the Mower poems?

There is troubling repetition of material in the book: the exhumation of Tom May’s body surfaces twice (the second time apparently innocent of the first appearance), and twice we get a pairing of Valentine Greatrakes with Prince Rupert. The authors twice reference Marvell’s refusal to apologize on the floor of the House for his aggressive behavior. On page 26 they raise the influence of Nathaniel Whiting’s *The Pleasant History of Albino and Bellama* on the Appleton House poem and resurrect the same influence twenty pages later (46) as if we are getting it for the first time. Such repetitions may be a casualty of joint authorship, but one would think that double proof-reading would double the chance to eliminate tautology. At the 2011 South-Central Renaissance Conference in St. Louis, Hirst and Zwicker explained their

method of composition as a true partnership: each paragraph is read and endorsed by the other team member before an article or chapter proceeds. A method that may seem a tedious process requires great faith in each other's insights and has worked well for them in their joint careers over the years. The present volume, however, demonstrates this method's strengths and weaknesses.

Hirst and Zwicker often set out to interpret Marvell's texts based on what they have imagined his life to have been. They admit as much, and given this investigation of Marvell's "imagined life," it is curious but wonderful to find at the end of their book that Hirst and Zwicker have little patience with the critics who have "imagined" a Restoration dating for "The Garden." Finally, Allan Pritchard's presumptive 1983 article claiming that for this poem Marvell was influenced by Katherine Philips and Abraham Cowley circa 1667 (for images and rhymes) has been anatomized at some length and happily demolished. In a refreshing appendix, Hirst-Zwicker attack the Pritchard conjectures that have received too much credence by Marvell scholars over the past three decades:

That there is verbal consonance among the texts of Marvell, Cowley, and Philips is beyond question; but that there was traffic among these three and that it flowed in a certain direction has to remain, for an era with abundant common sources and a flourishing manuscript culture, unproven. What is striking about the present academic conjuncture is the way a number of distinguished scholars have recognized the weakness of Pritchard's argument, at times offered evidence countering the argument, and yet accepted his re-dating. (175)

I hope the good sense of Hirst and Zwicker will forever lay to rest attempts to wrest early Marvell lyrics out of their suitable and time-honored place in the canon.

Since much of Marvell's life was not the focus of significant contemporary comment, Hirst and Zwicker are free to imagine all they wish, as long as they can convince a readership that their suppositions make sense. Sometimes they do (e.g., Marvell's concerns for children in distress), and sometimes they do not (e.g., Marvell's hidden jabs at Fairfax in "Upon Appleton House"). One thing is certain: they have

chosen an enviable human being for much of their mature scholarship. In *Orphan* they have brought to their study of Marvell's texts a great respect for the man not only as a writer but as a servant of the realm, and if they at times bludgeon their readers with over-zealous rapidity of referencing, their good intentions are always evident. For seasoned Marvellians *Orphan* will be a welcomed exercise in textual engagement.

Reid Barbour and David Norbrook, eds. *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson*. Volume I: Translation of Lucretius. 2 parts. Latin text ed. by Maria Cristina Zerbino. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. cxlvi + 797 pp. + 11 illus. \$375.00. Review by TANYA CALDWELL, GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY.

This first volume of *The Works of Lucy Hutchinson* establishes the project that raises to a status among the key authors of the seventeenth century a writer too long considered anomalous and relatively insignificant. Reid Barbour and David Norbrook acknowledge at the start that the unexpected size of this two-part edition of her translation of Lucretius may seem disproportionate to its history, but they argue that the text requires renewed attention for the various spheres of seventeenth-century philology and life into which it feeds. In particular, they endeavor to place the translation within the context of Hutchinson's "wider canon in new ways" in light of recent scholarly work revealing that "her literary ambitions extended to a long biblical poem" (xv). This scholarship is the culmination of many years of work and a body of publications by a coterie of scholars on both sides of the Atlantic headed by Barbour and Norbrook. The pioneering work on Hutchinson's surprising Lucretius began with Hugh de Quehen's edition in 1996.

Barbour and Norbrook's introduction (with a contribution from Jonathan Gibson) approaches monograph length as the scholars provide the most comprehensive discussion to date of the contexts of Hutchinson's translation. Dividing their introduction into seven major sections, each with several subsections, the editors range over a wealth of subjects. These include the controversial likely composition period of the translation; the English and European traditions of