

By way of linking the poem suggestively to the *vanitas* tradition (125-30), showing the extent to which the margin notes are more discursively expansive than the concise clarifying, nomenclatural, or indexical marginalia typical of the day (246), and indicting how *The Purple Island* figurality relates to Harveian anatomy especially as regards the systematic circulation of blood (351), Mitchell clarifies how the poem “develops a highly sophisticated soteriological epistemology and hermeneutics of the ‘scientific’ and poetic concepts of ingenuity and eloquence, which Fletcher’s religious prose shows us is modeled on the operation of the Holy Spirit in *ecclesia*, which is in turn modeled on the operation of the soul through the heart and brain in the human body” (478).

As the subtitle indicates, this is a book about anatomy in early modern literature, philosophy, and theology. It succeeds in delivering what is promised by situating *The Purple Island* in its social, political, scientific, and historical contexts. Mitchell is to be commended for showing contemporary readers how the whole of creation, as it was reckoned in seventeenth-century England, came to be subsumed in Fletcher’s Isle of Man.

Vera J. Camden, ed. *Trauma and Transformation: The Political Progress of John Bunyan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008. xiii + 185 pp. Cloth \$55.00. Review by WILLIAM W.E. SLIGHTS, UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

The key words “Trauma” and “Political” take on special significance in the title of this collection of eight essays, emerging as they did (all but one) from the Bunyan Triennial Conference held hard on the heels of 9/11/01. Vera J. Camden says in her introduction that the “national trauma” and “cultural cataclysm” following that day were “adumbrated” in Bunyan’s England:

Because of this conjunction between his time and ours, our scholarly discourse about religious pluralism and intolerance, rebellion against authority and the temptation to tyranny, the psychological impact of military and domestic service, the gendering of dissent and the dissent from gen-

dered imperatives, and the impact of cultural change on the experience of national subjects—to name just a few of the topics treated in this volume—took on an immediacy that could not have been premeditated but that now appears to have been—to follow Bunyan—“foreordained” (4).

The claim of causal foreordination aside, this is a pretty accurate summary of the book’s main themes.

Several of the essays in this revisionist collection launch highly provocative claims: “T. S. Eliot’s theory of the ‘dissociation of sensibility’ . . . can safely be deemed to have been the single most seminal contribution to English literary history of the twentieth century”(14); “Bunyan experienced the loss of his mother and sister, as well as the rejection of his father, by remarriage, as oedipal longings, as well as oedipal rage at the father during this period of his late adolescence and early manhood” (58); “It seems (all of a sudden) that, from the opening reference to Bunyan taking his pen in hand to the final pulling on the distaff, the ‘Apology’ to *The Pilgrim’s Progress* might well harbor more puns on sexual generation and male sexual parts than we might either have expected or be able to comfortably accept” (104). The first of these assertions is seriously compromised by David Norbrook’s rebuttal, courageously printed in the volume; the second takes some hard knocks as the methods of Freudian psychology repeatedly jostle against those of the New Historicism; the third achieves a glorious vindication through a skillful reading of Bunyan’s dirty jokes and his theology. But this is just a sampling of the richly debatable material set forth for the reader of *Trauma and Transformation*.

To my mind, the biggest issue raised but not resolved in these pages is whether and how psychoanalytic criticism can be squared with historicist approaches. The three essays quoted above deal with the question head-on, and several others address it tangentially. In her introduction Camden lays out an almost orthodox New Historicist agenda: “The essays here collected thus make up the question of Bunyan’s ‘political progress’ from the many different perspectives engaged by such public and private interaction; they each recognize that the political culture of seventeenth-century England is reflected in and reflective of the religious, social, cultural, and psychological lives of its subjects” (3-4). Only the term “psychological” feels out of

place in this methodological outline, but it is placed front-and-center in Camden's "frankly speculative" (43) account of Bunyan's "devotedly chronicled psychomachia" (6) and Rudnytsky's argument that "as the moment at which patriarchal culture literally acted out the killing of the primal father in the person of the king, the execution of Charles I is not only a collective trauma, but one to which a traditional Freudian perspective is singularly well suited" (16). However suggestive the psychoanalyst's paradigms may be for the interpretation of literature, the fully-articulated political debates of the mid-seventeenth century are likely to provide a stronger foundation for placing Bunyan historically than guesswork about the collective mind of the age or the repressed mind of the author (37).

Several essays come at Bunyan's sexuality and his representations of sexuality from non-Freudian angles. Thomas H. Luxon finds that Bunyan embraces neither the humanist's Greco-Roman ideals of male-male friendship nor the Christian enthusiasm for sexual expression within marriage. In works such as his handbook for domestic governance, *Christian Behaviour* (1663), Bunyan rejects both the complete equality implicit in the classical model of loving and the sexual companionship of unequals commonly promulgated by Puritan divines. Eschewing Milton's accommodation of the softer, humanist tradition, Bunyan lapses into a misogynist view of anyone who requires a female helpmeet as a "meer Natural Man" (95).

Margaret J.M. Ezell shares Luxon's view but prefers to root her position not in what he calls an "intensely dogmatic allegorical hermeneutics" (Luxon 98), but in Bunyan's traumatic encounters with two actual women. One was Margaret Pryor, defended by Bunyan in a now-lost pamphlet against accusations by certain Quakers that she was a witch who took on the form of a horse. The other was Agnes Beaumont, who described a horseback ride behind Mr. Bunyan in highly erotic terms. It was these encounters and the "complex social dynamics" he had to negotiate as a spiritual leader, and not some abstract formulation of female sexuality, that, according to Ezell, rendered him incapable ever of "carry[ing] it pleasant towards a Woman" (*Grace Abounding*). I must admit some disappointment that the elegant chiasmus of Ezell's title, "Bunyan's Women, Women's Bunyan," didn't lead to a discussion of the multitudes of women readers who helped

to keep Bunyan's books at the top of the Protestant best-seller list for centuries. The real appeal to this segment of his audience was probably not the bawdy wordplay that, according to Michael Davies, reveals a powerful "tension between temptation and resistance" in Bunyan's sexual demeanor (117).

The most explicitly "political" essays in the collection are those by Roger Pooley on Bunyan's antinomianism and by Sharon Achinstein on the changed political climate under James II that allowed Bunyan to slip from the world without a martyr's send-off. Vera Camden, however, makes a strong case for considering all aspects of seventeenth-century theological controversy in a political light. Her collection does an admirable job of shining that light on one of the period's seminal writers and one who is too often underrated in an age that has largely forgotten how to read the complex base-texts of the Christian faith.

Peter Walmsley. *Locke's Essay and the Rhetoric of Science*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2003. 199 pp. + 15 illus. \$42.50. Review by MARK G. SPENCER, BROCK UNIVERSITY.

In this handsomely produced, nicely illustrated, and well-written volume in the Bucknell Studies in Eighteenth-Century Literature and Culture series, edited by Greg Clingham, Peter Walmsley aims to give us "a book about the writing of science in late seventeenth-century England, a reconstruction of Locke's rhetorical context so that we may more ably read the *Essay* as it is embedded in its social and intellectual moment" (17). Important here is Locke's aim for an "HISTORICAL, PLAIN Method"; his contention, as he put it in his "Epistle to the Reader," that he will "*be employed as an Under-Labourer in clearing Ground a little, and removing some of the Rubbish, that lies in the way to Knowledge*" (17). Readers of this journal will know Walmsley for, amongst other things, his ground-breaking study on *The Rhetoric of Berkeley's Philosophy* (1990). In the book under review here, Walmsley's six chapters—1. Writing a Natural History of Mind; 2. Embryology and the Progress of the Understanding; 3. Experimental Essays; 4. Wit and Hypothesis; 5. Dispute and Conversation; and 6. Civil and