some significant conclusions. The first is that the requirements, such as the acceptance of the Book of Common Prayer and the necessity of episcopal ordination, were imposed upon clergy before the Act of Uniformity became law in 1662, with the penalty for refusing being ejection from livings or denial of institution. At the same time, however, the bishops who were handling the subscriptions were mainly moderate ones who acted with restraint. Second, they note that, even after the passage of the Act in 1662, the orthodox bishops and church hierarchy left the job of enforcing the Act to the more lenient prelates so that a number of ministers, who otherwise would have been removed, were able to stay. Such conclusions, as they point out, require a reconsideration of the Restoration clergy.

On the whole, this is a very useful collection which introduces some of the new trends in the examination of the English Revolution. The essays are well researched and a number will have a major impact on seventeenth-century studies. There are other topics which could have profitably been included, such as the outbreak of the Revolution, the New Model Army and the religious contentions that divided England and Scotland. In addition, a compilation of Professor Morrill’s distinguished body of work would have been appropriate. That being said, this collection of essays is a fitting tribute to an outstanding historian.


Jennifer C. Vaught’s *Carnival and Literature in Early Modern England* is a knowledgeable, if somewhat underrealized, analysis of literary appropriations of carnival and festive rituals in early modern England. Vaught sets out to contest the ideological rigidity of prior studies on the subject, namely their tendency to understand carnival as the province of either the common folk or the cultural elite. She maintains that “festivity during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was neither the jurisdiction of high nor low constituents but was ideologically malleable and accessible to everyone” (8). The strength
of Vaught’s self-described “folkloric” approach is that it enables her to uncover the expressive versatility as well as the local diversity of the carnivalesque mode in and beyond the early modern period.

In Chapter One, Vaught considers the prevalence of clowns, tricksters, cross-dressers, masquers, and other carnivalesque figures in Marlowe’s Doctor Faustus and The Jew of Malta, and in Shakespeare’s The Merchant of Venice. According to Vaught, Faustus is rendered as a “grotesque imperialist” whose insatiable greed and hedonistic appetites mirror the excesses of English imperialism, while Barabas and Shylock represent “alien scapegoats” whose mistreatment under entrenched social, political, and economic institutions is exposed by the plays’ strategic invocation of carnival and festive contexts. Vaught proceeds to explore how the legacy of carnivalesque figures endured in seventeenth-, eighteenth-, and nineteenth-century puppet productions of these plays, with a particular focus on adaptations of the Faust legend. She concludes that, in these productions, puppetry “functioned as a distant reminder of subversive protest among the lower ranks but ultimately as a tool for the upper and middle ranks to amass capital” (55).

Chapter Two examines how Spenser assimilates wide-ranging carnivalesque materials to his Protestant, republican beliefs in The Shepheardes Calendar and The Faerie Queene. In contrast to Marlowe and Shakespeare, in whose works Vaught detects radical egalitarian sympathies, Spenser’s republicanism is steeped in ambivalence. For example, in her reading of Book Two of The Faerie Queene, Vaught notes that the tortured denizens of the house of the Mammon resemble “laborers at the heart of an exploitative, nascent capitalistic economy, which Spenser critiques in terms of its dehumanizing price” (78). However, the diverse throng grasping at the figure of Ambition in the same room also suggests that “avarice infects all ranks and ignites destructive, selfish desires for advancement among elite and popular groups” (78). Other carnivalesque episodes in The Faerie Queene—the Masque of Cupid in Book Three, the “May-game” ritual in Book Five, Serena’s brush with gluttonous cannibals in Book Six—paint a similarly varied picture, leading Vaught to conclude that “Spenser’s meditations on republicanism and liberty in connection to carnivalesque modes vacillate from whole-hearted support, to skeptical ambivalence, to
deep-seated anxiety” (90).

In Chapter Three, Vaught examines how Dekker, Shakespeare, and Jonson enlisted carnival materials to comment on the new commercial realities of early modern England, where emerging market economies opened up increased avenues for social advancement. In addition to observing the numerous festive and holiday motifs that populate Dekker’s *The Shoemaker’s Holiday* and Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night*, Vaught points to the rise and fall of the plays’ upwardly mobile aspirants—Hammon and Malvolio, respectively—as evidence of “the imagined pleasures and perils of social mobility in a carnivalesque space and time” (100). Vaught then analyzes how *The Winter’s Tale* expresses nostalgia for the rural, seasonal pastimes of the pre-mercantile era. This analysis includes an illuminating discussion of the cultural ramifications of the middle and upper class vogue for ornamental clocks and watches, which “carried with them greater enforcement of rank, gender, and occupational differences than did more neutral, cosmological and seasonal temporal markers” (115). *Bartholomew Fair*, according to Vaught, likewise uses its festival setting (the feast of St. Bartholomew) to lament the replacement of communal festivities by an individualistic market economy.

The book’s fourth and final chapter, “The Decline of Carnivalesque Egalitarianism,” will be of greatest interest to seventeenth-century specialists. Focusing on Milton’s Ludlow Masque and Herrick’s *Hesperides*, Vaught argues that the Caroline age witnessed the gradual waning of egalitarian influence in literary representations of carnival. According to Vaught, Milton’s masque adapts popular as well as elite festive rituals both to promote Puritan values of temperance and moderation and to protest the tyrannical impulses of Charles I. By contrast, Herrick uses these materials in *Hesperides* for conservative, normative purposes. “In Herrick’s book of poems,” writes Vaught, “he imaginatively revives these customs so that they become occasions for unifying the lower and upper ranks against the mounting power of middle-ranking Puritans, who had historically opposed and in effect outlawed feast-day rituals” (137). The second half of Chapter Four investigates carnivalesque appropriations of Spenser and Milton in nineteenth-century America, in particular the post-Civil War South. In Vaught’s analysis, these appropriations were largely devoid of egali-
tarian import and often used toward racist ends. In the parades staged by Mistick Krewe of Comus, a New Orleans Mardi Gras organization, the masque’s multi-ethnic namesake is reimagined an unambiguously English trickster icon; Milton’s republican sympathies, in turn, are replaced by nostalgia for aristocratic hierarchy. Vaught concludes that the Mistick Krewe of Comus, the Twelfth Night Revelers, and other Mardi Gras krewes “equipped themselves with satirical parades, exclusive balls, and canonical Renaissance texts in order to attack those who threatened to topple their hierarchical pyramid in post-war Louisiana” (167).

While Vaught rightly notes the dearth of scholarship on carnivalesque non-dramatic literature, her study ventures only slightly into this corpus of texts. It would have been useful to devote a chapter to, say, Jonson’s court masques, particularly as they anticipate the spectacular festivities of the Mardi Gras organizations. Indeed, the transhistorical, crosscultural analysis that Vaught provides in the final chapter is the most compelling aspect of the book, and it deserves to be treated at greater length. Throughout her analysis, Vaught glances at connections between the early modern carnivalesque and its nineteenth-century American counterpart. These connections are as informative as they are fascinating, yet the book abruptly ends without pulling these loose threads together, thus obscuring the problematic association of Herrick’s “conservative monarchism” with the reactionary politics of the Mardi Gras krewes. Beyond the emergence of these ideologies as the byproducts of civil wars, without further context, it is unclear how either is implicated in “the decline of carnivalesque egalitarianism.” In fact, Vaught’s Herrick seems to have more in common with Milton. While she states that their political appropriations of the carnivalesque “differ dramatically” (133), her more intriguing observation is what they have in common: a desire to protect the festive customs of old from Puritan reform.

In the end, Vaught is less interested in producing a coherent narrative of republican egalitarianism than in unsettling the divide between high and low culture. In this respect, the book succeeds splendidly. Vaught has produced a study of considerable scope and ambition, and her readings of the texts collectively illustrate the profound extent to which carnival themes and motifs permeated the literature and culture
of early modern England. More importantly, by extending her focus to the nineteenth-century American South, she shows how the legacy of the carnivalesque persists in unexpected and troubling ways.


Enhanced by forty reproductions of early modern printed images, Katherine Acheson’s *Visual Rhetoric and Early Modern English Literature* explores the rich modes of representation embodied in seventeenth-century illustrations and diagrams, texts that “contributed to frameworks of thought” in early modern England (7). Acheson began her research with “a survey of all illustrated works contained in EEBO up to 1640, and selected genres up to 1680” (5), yet limits herself in the book to a small sample of representative genres that rely on visual rhetoric: guides to military tactics and gardening, biblical genealogies, painting and drawing manuals, and illustrated works of natural history. The common thread connecting these genres is a focus on “diagrams and illustrations of a technical nature,” which, according to Acheson, “insinuated ways of thinking in their audiences” (2) that could be applied to non-technical texts such as poems and early novels. Through a series of compelling literary close readings—structured around the touchstone concepts of “Space,” “Truth,” “Art,” and “Nature”—Acheson proceeds to interpret these visual genres in relation to canonical texts by Marvell, Milton, and Behn.

The main contribution of *Visual Rhetoric and Early Modern English Literature* lies in its illuminating corrective to the common critical neglect of diagrams and other non-linear, non-perspectival, non-narrative printed images in the study of early modern visual culture: “Why have diagrams been neglected”? (2), Acheson asks. One of her main points about this neglected corner of visual culture studies is that a diagram is not simply an “illustration.” Rather, these images have a distinct function as expressions of visual rhetoric, which “allow[s] us to interpret visual phenomena as visual phenomena, rather than as versions of things that could be as well or even better said in