

information about madness and melancholy in ways both useful to the specialist and engaging to the more general reader.

Hodgkin also has a shrewd eye for which of the less obvious aspects of Fitzherbert's sometimes unruly narrative are valuable from a historical and literary perspective. She notes her conscious construction of herself as an author, exploring her place in the emerging canon of women's life-writing. She also unpacks in interesting ways the somewhat anomalous position of a woman of Fitzherbert's background who chooses not to marry (indeed sets her face firmly against it) and instead pursues a life of single devotion to God.

Overall, this volume represents an extremely valuable contribution to the study of early modern women's writing. Hodgkin not only presents a meticulously edited version of this fascinating document, but also highlights skillfully and sympathetically the many ways in which it speaks to contemporary critical interest in gender, mental illness, notions of self, practices of self-writing, and the role of piety in early modern female life. The book is an excellent addition to this admirable Ashgate series.

Erin Murphy. *Familial Forms: Politics and Genealogy in Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 2011. 307 pp. \$65.00. Review by LISSA BEAUCHAMP DESROCHES, ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY.

The family-state analogy in seventeenth-century Britain, specifically in terms of its connection to the issues of lineal succession, is the focus of Erin Murphy's book. She offers a comprehensive analysis, drawing attention to the use of the metaphor of domesticity for political houses in literary senses as well as to the practical application of genealogies that tied monarchical families to biblical ones. In addition to this, she describes how the term "family" can, for various political purposes, be concerned with either marriage or reproduction. This involves a close consideration of how the female gender operates or is erased, depending on how seventeenth-century writers configured the analogy and how tricky their genealogies proved to be. Murphy does an admirable job of directing her attention in her extended analyses

of works by John Milton, Lucy Hutchinson, John Dryden, and Mary Astell, as well as some initial discussion of works by Robert Filmer, Robert Parsons, James I, and Aemilia Lanyer.

In the first chapter, Murphy examines three kinds of texts by way of establishing common seventeenth-century rhetorical strategies for dealing with the family-state analogy: the father-king analogy (Filmer and James I), the marital model of contractual politics (Parsons and James I), and the model of spiritual/intellectual reproduction offered by a predominantly female kind of community (Lanyer). Sir Robert Filmer's works "literaliz[e] the patriarchalist analogy" in his use of genealogy, arguing "that the relationship between a father and a king is one of identity, rather than similarity" (33). Murphy comments that "Through his mobilization of genealogical narrative, Filmer frees his political doctrine of inheritance from the bondage of actual reproduction" (34). The mother and maternity are thereby also erased, as is any question of bastardy.

John Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel* is the subject of chapter 7, and in it Murphy considers how Dryden struggles to reconfigure lineal succession in the literal absence of reproduction, in order to support James II's nomination as successor to Charles II, who had no legitimate progeny. Like Filmer, Dryden has to erase reproduction and mobilize the patriarchal notion of genealogical inheritance from Adam as first father. Murphy's analysis considers also how other Genesis stories helped Dryden "figure rebirth without childbirth" (177). Dryden employs typology to figure Charles II as an echo of David, and he "insists on a theory of inheritance that binds the people" to obedience while the king is bound only to God (185). Thus, "under divine right, the king fulfills God on earth . . . holding a space in which the present can unfold. . . [T]ypology reoriented to the present allows the king to reclaim the power of fulfillment from dissenting forces" (195). In other words, "by representing the present as a moment of fulfillment, and the king as its guardian" the threat of non-linear succession is overcome (195). Thus, while "*Absalom and Achitophel* may embrace paternity, it avoids patriarchalism" (203).

Conversely, in *A Conference About the Next Succession to the Crowne of England* (1595), Robert Parsons "argues for succession based on birth. He admits that reproduction provides continuity and emphasizes the

bonds between a father and a son" (37). But he also promotes the idea that the consent of the people is an important element of monarchical rule. Ultimately, Parsons proposes "a decidedly non-hierarchical image of Adam and Eve as the type of all society" (39) while still insisting on a patriarchalist theory of political governance. Murphy explains that "Parsons uses the connection between husband and wife as a way to reimagine politics" (40).

James I's uses of his own genealogy worked to authorize his possession of the throne, but interestingly, he refers to both his ancestry and his progeny in terms of how his family is the state. In this way, genealogy can work both ways: "Though he may describe himself as the husband of England, it is as the grandson of Margaret and the father of Charles that he sits as king" (51). Borrowing both from Filmer and Parsons, James I rests his authority in his identity as a father to his children and as a father-king to his people: "James comes from a line of kings" and "he brings with him a line of future kings" (58); thus "the royal heir, like Christ, embodies the power to move the nation beyond mortality" (60).

Chapters 2, 3, and 4 deal with how Milton's *Paradise Lost* uses "family politics" from Charles I to Charles II. In the first of these three chapters on Milton, Murphy discusses how Milton strategically removes the notion of paternal kingship embodied and promoted by James I and replaces it with a domestic vision of marriage in Eden, like Parsons. Through an examination of the allegory of Satan, Sin, and Death in chapter 3, Murphy considers how Milton constructs patriarchal notions of paternity and kingship as not only incestuous, but monstrous and ultimately self-consuming. Then he envisions how Eve contracts herself willingly to Adam, echoing Parsons's view of how marriage is a more appropriate model for social relations. Finally, in chapter 4, Murphy offers a fascinating perspective of the less than dramatically compelling final books, when Milton dispels the dramatic mood as he removes Eve from the narrative, putting her to sleep while Michael narrates to Adam the future of his now postlapsarian race. By concentrating on "what remains" as opposed to "what disappears" from the last two books of *Paradise Lost*, Murphy identifies a shift to a more genealogical narration (126). This shift provides a way to translate lineal succession from a domestic and familial setting to one of purified

political concerns; drama, domesticity, and the female go together in “an earthly sanctuary in which the family exists safe from the realm of government” (118). This re-imagined domesticity is thereby contracted to Adam, and remains a viable model for society, but is distinct from the issues of politics and kingship that concern him alone.

Similarly, Lucy Hutchinson’s *Order and Disorder* employs the marital model for society to overcome the limits and even anguish of reproduction, but from a wifely and maternal point of view: “Hutchinson uses marriage as a figure of consent. . . . Marriage becomes a source of national stability in the face of the force and deceit of monarchy” for the republican cause (158-159). As for Milton, for Hutchinson “marriage forms the ground of all society” (159), but “the theme of maternity and motherhood as a source of disruption and grief runs throughout the poem, defining some of Hutchinson’s most striking verse . . . the present-day voice of the narrator rails against the pain of motherhood, while the marginal citations echo her sadness with references to biblical scenes of maternal anguish” (163). The anguish of the maternal body is transfigured into an emotional trauma. The challenge, then, of reproduction omits the notion of hereditary succession of monarchies. Instead, Hutchinson uses typology to cast her husband as a type of Adam and Christ, omitting the monarchical figures of Charles I and II. In doing so, “Hutchinson’s poetic form connects her to a world of women through her use of typology . . . [she] links the pain of childbirth with the sorrow of the crucifixion, and the joy of motherhood with the promise of Christ’s resurrection” (169). Ultimately, Hutchinson “finds solace by making the past present through the performance of marital conversation” between Adam and Eve, thereby re-imagining the family-state analogy in marital terms that omit monarchical status entirely and which invest meaning in her text to memorialize her husband and their marriage rather than in her children, who challenge her with suffering that she must overcome.

At the end of the first chapter, Murphy discusses how Lanyer places mother and daughter before father and son as reproducers of genealogical connection, “focusing on Christ as king and portraying women as his brides” (63). Lanyer’s configuration of family rests on the “shared lineage” of all her readers, which undermines any sense of paternal or patriarchal claims for monarchical status. Lanyer employs a rhetorical

strategy of typological connections between Old and New Testament figures and Jacobean fulfillment; thus the “spiritual inheritance of divine history” authorizes women in a genealogical way (65). Similar to Hutchinson, instead of valorizing maternity and motherhood as material experiences, Lanyer provides a sense of literature itself as “an alternative form of reproduction” (67).

The reproductive status of the text is a theme that Lanyer and Hutchinson share with Mary Astell, whose *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies* and other works are the subject of the eighth and final chapter. Astell’s works, like Lanyer’s but more so, rely on a model of marriage and family that is dysfunctional for society, and so must be addressed in future changes—thus the form of the proposal: “Though she advocates education to improve the domestic by producing better mothers and more patient wives, her greatest faith lies beyond the family, not just in religion but in the fluid spaces created by circulation” (211). Astell’s vivid and trenchant political criticism here is something Murphy examines with reference not only to her attitudes regarding marriage, which have garnered much critical observation, but also with attention to her notions of reproduction, which, like Lanyer’s, translate the notion into spiritual and emotional terms. Like Dryden too in a way, Astell “resolves the complexity and inadequacy of lineage through an appeal to obedience as its own principle” (218-219). Like Lanyer and Hutchinson, she constructs a notion of female suffering (though in marriage rather than maternity) that has value only in “leading them to the true state of bliss in heaven” (220). But Murphy’s main point regarding Astell’s text is that she addresses it to ladies, and in doing so “she calls into being a community of women readers.... Astell opens up a category defined by the text itself ... her reading community remains unbounded ... [and] builds on an emerging sense of the public sphere ... Her emphasis on the voluntary quality of the retreat marks its distance from the family ... [which she imagines] as a realm of dominance and submission analogous to the state” (230-231). Thus, “Astell’s claim for single women articulates a version of the family-state analogy without either the family or the state” (236).

Chapter 5 is an oddly brief chapter that outlines the second half of the book, in which Murphy considers the three chronologically later texts. As already outlined, Lucy Hutchinson’s *Order and Dis-*

order (chapter 6), John Dryden's *Absalom and Achitophel* (chapter 7), and Mary Astell's *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies* (chapter 8) all approach the notions of family-state analogy, genealogy, marriage and reproduction, patriarchal paternity, and lineal succession in a variety of ways that echo ideas already discussed in the first chapter and the chapters on Milton in the first half of the book. Clearly, the predominant structural factor in Murphy's organization of the book is the historical chronology of texts, and she does insist on reducing the often inspired readings of her chosen texts to historical references by structuring and concluding her arguments this way. As a result, anyone reading the book with a preference for literary interpretation or for particular variations of the family-state analogy may find the second half repetitive, and perhaps this could be frustrating. Certainly, the historical chronology of events could have been honored just as well in more coherent and cohesively arranged discussions of the rhetorical strategies that resembled each other.

And yet, anyone interested in domestic metaphors, the use of Genesis narratives, typology as a rhetorical device, marriage and/or reproduction metaphors, or the family-state analogy as used by seventeenth-century writers in a number of contexts and permutations would find Murphy's book good reading. Her prose is clear and her insights complex without being overworked and her readings are illuminating indeed, excavating new ways to look at these texts that develop our understanding of the intersections between them. Murphy's contribution here to our historical understanding of how the family-state analogy operates fluidly will certainly engender further study.

Michelle M. Dowd, and Julie A. Eckerle, eds. *Genre and Women's Life Writing in Early Modern England*. Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing, 2007. xii + 211 pp. \$99.95. Review by JEFFREY P. BECK, EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY.

Anyone who has ever read a blog post (meaning most human beings capable of reading who have internet access) will be aware that countless individuals are documenting their lives online, and any literary historian or critic will be aware that such blog posts hardly fit with