

It should be noted, finally, that Jane Marie Todd's translation of the 1997 *Le Poète et le Roi* (Paris: Éditions de Fallois) was a finalist for the French-American Foundation's 2002 Translation Prize. It was a well-deserved honor both for her graceful rendering of Fumaroli's text, as well as the translations of the many citations from La Fontaine and other writers.

J. Douglas Canfield. *The Baroque in English Neoclassical Literature*. Delaware: University of Delaware Press; 2003. 252 pp. \$47.50. Review by SUSAN B. IWANISZIW, INDEPENDENT SCHOLAR.

J. Douglas Canfield categorizes the paradoxical elements of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century poems and the few plays and novels he discusses in this volume as exemplars of the "baroque." He considers baroque paradox the means by which authors subverted prevailing codes of neoclassical rationality, asserting that paradox and conundrum offered sites for popular resistance to the status quo—whether resistance addressed classical literary form, sexual morality, politics, religion, or even publishing. He names each manifestation of baroque paradox in separate chapters: the mysterious, metaphysical, material, mischievous, reflexive, paradoxical, cryptic, ventriloquistic, parasitical, metaphorical, mocking, surrogate, eccentric, and absurd. A coda for each chapter emphasizes Canfield's claim that baroque paradox traduced neoclassical expectations—in short, that "[i]n the baroque neoclassical, despite the will to order, things fall apart and the center cannot hold" (188).

The book incorporates a number of his essays published between 1975 and 1995, and Canfield's early work on Milton was evidently determinative. Building upon an essay published in 1975 about the paradox of God's "mysterious terms" seeming "best" in *Paradise Lost*, Canfield augments his argument for intentional paradox with theoretical readings (from Derrida, Deleuze, and Foucault) and cultural, historical and material context. If memory serves, throughout his distinguished career Canfield has revealed a

predisposition for orderliness by his creation of elaborate literary taxonomies. He is, therefore, an unexpected candidate to address these subversions of textual orderliness, but, of course, he does so by assembling a new taxonomy in which to contain the puzzles and contrarities he detects in his literary samples. His argument develops in a sequence of chapters, loosely linked, each based on one writer's significant baroque works or the works of two writers coupled by virtue of the same baroque method. Pope alone earns two chapters: "Pope: Metaphorically Meant" and "Pope: Mockingly Meant." Canfield's inclusion of poems by Margaret Cavendish, Katherine Philips, Aphra Behn, Anne Killigrew and Anne Finch, and Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, at least half as many women writers as men, is a gratifying acknowledgment of women's contributions to British literature of the long eighteenth century. Dealing with canonical writers separately and teaming others in gender-specific and usually class-specific couples using the same baroque technique, he pursues a vague chronology, starting with Milton's *Paradise Lost* and concluding with John Gay's *Beggar's Opera* and Henry Fielding's *The Author's Farce*. His technique involves "reading out"—that is, a close reading to generate an exploration of the fissures arising in supposedly neoclassical texts. It is these fissures which shape the crucial paradoxes.

Canfield urges the next generation of critics—his "children"—to continue the work begun here, and he proposes the term "neo-baroque" to classify their endeavors (191). Because contemporary Anglo-American scholars tend to bypass formal classification schemes in favor of reading literature in a cultural/historical or theoretical context, it is hard to foresee the impact of this study. Of course, he provides cultural and theoretical background, at least sufficient to his arguments, but he is sparing with detail, providing no dates of the birth and death of authors and few in-text references to publication or performance dates. At times, he fails to define terms, assuming that his readers are as familiar with the eighteenth-century world as he and the scholars whom he cites. Pope's view of Pelagianism is a case in point. However, drawing on Derrida's notions of *différance* and the *pharmakon*, he takes pains to draw

Pope's character as it is exposed in "The Rape of the Lock" and other poems. To be sure, he also describes George Villiers's sexual history in the discussion of "The Lost Mistress, a Complaint against the Countess of—", and he discusses *The Beggar's Opera* in the context of Britain's incipient capitalism.

Despite a few shortcomings that particularly affect an inexperienced reader, this book showcases Canfield's masterly grasp of the playfulness and ambiguities of these various works. Receptive scholars may well enhance their own theoretical and cultural studies with his technique of "reading out" that revises and revitalizes trite or moribund postulates. In his foreword, J. Paul Hunter suggests that Canfield's taxonomy might serve as a textbook for literature classes (11-12), and, surely, it will prove invaluable to any teacher preparing Restoration and eighteenth-century survey classes for undergraduate students. But, the book also supplements existing sources for in-depth studies of the featured writers and their *oeuvres*. An added bonus to readers tackling this intriguing collection of essays written by this erudite and meticulous scholar is that they are likely to return to familiar texts and writers with keener pleasure.

Although the chapters are not uniformly fascinating, certain essays are quite wonderful. Canfield's account of the misidentification of the Marys in Behn's "Congratulatory Poem to Her Sacred Majesty, Queen Mary, upon Her Arrival in England" is a gem; his account of the Charles Gildon-Edmund Curll edition of Shakespearean sonnets incomprehensibly, parasitically attached to both Nicholas Rowe's and Alexander Pope's editions of Shakespeare's works exposes what is tantamount (in literary terms) to a cosmic joke. Again, his appreciation of Mary Montagu's poetics and her delightful wit in depicting a woman's point of view is both salutary and amusing. Canfield considerably supplies an appendix containing the lesser-known poems he cites, though his textual editing is perhaps pedantic, considering the probable readership of the book. For example, he deletes a prior editor's topical allusions in Charles Sackville's "A Song," while most readers would probably

find the interpolations rather helpful. And, for George Villiers's "The Lost Mistress," a poem with several variant versions, he produces twenty lines of detailed bibliographic explication to justify one substantive decision. The book includes a list of secondary works—but no list of primary works, which must be gleaned from the Notes—and an Index.

H. Rodney Nevitt, Jr. *Art and the Culture of Love in Seventeenth-Century Holland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. xvii + 302 pp. + 89 b&w illustrations. \$80.00. Review by HANNEKE GROOTENBOER, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Art and the Culture of Love in Seventeenth-Century Holland by H. Rodney Nevitt explores the dynamic between imagery of love and its intended audience, the Dutch youth of the Golden Age. One of the goals of this book is to reconstitute that audience's response in order to find "a closer joining of moral content and sensual pleasure than has generally been described by scholars" (18) in the so-called merry companies by Willem Buytenwech (c. 1591-1624), the garden parties of David Vinckboons (1576-c. 1632) and his follower Esaias van de Velde (1590-1630), couples observing peasant scenes by Jan Miense Molenaer (1610-1668), outdoor portraits by Frans Hals (1582-1666), as well as in prints included in *vrijerijboeken* (courting books) and songbooks. Nevitt imagines the Dutch youth as engaged viewers who respond to moralizing messages with an ambivalent mixture of humor, self-recognition, and moral judgment, and who did not find the union of instruction and delight these pictures convey at all contradictory. In contrast to the apparently laid back youth he investigates, Nevitt considers the intertwining of morals with pleasure in pictures of flirting adolescents highly problematic. Each of the three chapters of this book deals with ambiguous motifs, gestures, and tropes in various sub-genres of love imagery that challenge iconographic interpretation.