essays, occasionally its attempts to probe the complexities of Milton’s attitude toward the nation seem reducible to a shrugging “it’s complicated”: on the one hand, Milton’s nationalism does have an exclusionary aspect; on the other hand, it’s not narrowly so. While it is surely true that Milton’s nationalism is, as Stevens says, “Janus-faced”—and one of the volume’s most useful contributions is a reminder that nationalism is not always a dirty word—there are times when analysis seems sidestepped. Nevertheless, such moments do not change the fact that this collection is essential reading for anyone interested in Early Modern nationalism. It should be welcomed by all scholars of Milton.


Lauren Shohet’s Reading Masques: The English Masque and Public Culture in the Seventeenth Century is the first study to examine masques from a reception and production vantage point. Masque performances at the courts of James I and Charles I were significant, socially important, elite occasions for the aristocratic audiences who participated in them. Shohet expands conventional understanding of the form to examine the masque as written text, topic of oral exchange, subject of ballads and operas, and source for play adaptation. Her examination includes masque circulation and ways to ‘read’ a masque; she also investigates the role of music in signifying the masque’s occasion. What Shohet’s study makes clear is the form’s viability within an increasingly literary culture, a culture outside the masque’s original venue and one comprised of production modes such as printing and distribution alongside the dynamic news potential and public theatre of the time.

Chapter 1 enlarges the range of experiences between masques and their audiences. Arguing that masques “recycle the genre they inherit and adapt it to other uses,” Shohet notes the intertextuality between Jonson’s 1608 Masque of Beauty and Beaumont and Fletcher’s c. 1608-11 masque set in The Maid’s Tragedy (45). She notes similar arguments in Cupid’s Banishment, the girls’ school masque presented to
Queen Anna and her ladies and *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue* (1617-18) performed eight months later. The masques offer different endings, however, as the masque for a queen suggests pleasure must disappear in order to maintain virtue, while *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue* can be accomplished with concentrated effort. The illuminating discussion in this chapter addresses *The Triumph of Peace*, scripted by James Shirley, composed by William Laws and Simon Ives, and designed by Inigo Jones and John Webb. With two performances that originated in the public street and progressed to a performance venue, this masque argues for reception, dissemination, and public involvement (67). Its topical satire was not only viewed but also read; such reception, Shohet argues, suggests that the masque can include many views.

Chapter 2 considers masque publication history and speaks to the “double life” the form occupies in the private court milieu and in the “nascent print public sphere” (81). Shohet offers evidence of the emerging literary environment that indicates extensive masque readership. The number of print masques available for sale in publishers’ catalogues, listed in the Stationers’ Register, and published by scribes shows significant usage, suggesting there may well have been more readers than chronicled. Booksellers’ lists and printed collections indicate demand, and marginal annotations confirm readership. Shohet argues that the published masque “represent(s) the invisible majority of early modern books” (86-87). She notes the performance details and reader-direction in the *Masque of Flowers* (1614) presented by Francis Bacon and Gray’s Inn for the Somerset wedding, which further enriches the exchange between masque and its reception.

Chapter 3 “unpacks how the modes of authority peformatively negotiate the conditions” of the genre’s “practices” (125). Reading *The Irish Masque at Court*, scripted by Ben Jonson, performed twice in 1613 and first printed in 1616, Shohet teases out the ways in which the masque weakens its own agenda. The masque posits a mockery of Irishmen and their language; however, the project backfires. As she notes, “If printed Irish language looks stable and deviant, by comparison the English language appears stable and normative” (140). The world of the King’s English is not the only linguistic choice. Similarly, *For the Honour of Wales* foregrounds the precarious circumstances language creates through metonymy. In * Honour*, a masque with a place
name as indicative of its entirety, Jacobean authority is exploited by destabilizing one linguistic type in favor of another “equally unstable one” (148).

In chapter 4, an exceptional survey of the masque and news nexus, Shohet argues for these forms as promulgating public opinion as a political force. Information viewed as news was communicated through personal letters, social gatherings, and public houses throughout the kingdom; masque content interested courtiers and outsiders. Participant roles, dance invitations, and audience behavior comprised epistolary accounts, especially because masques encoded political sub-text. Shohet points out that the audiences/readers not at court were knowledgeable and interested in masque content even amidst the dearth of printed and sanctioned public discussion. Examples of widespread public interest in masques conveying news include *The Golden Age Restored* (1616) as it addresses the trial of those suspected of poisoning Thomas Overbury, and *News from the World* (1620), which foregrounds the emergent news industry’s potential failings with volatile and empty information. Interpreting the start of the Thirty Years War, *Pan’s Anniversary* (1621) characterizes and reacts to public opinion; this masque also asserts the people’s concern for government’s ill-conceived decisions.

Chapter 5 positions the masques in a changing public culture. Shohet introduces *The Sacred Joy*, a welcome celebration for Charles II’s 1660 return to England. Offered in print before the occasion, the tale of rebellion and punishment highlights the masque’s political voice and points to “consensus” for the monarch’s restoration (193). The chapter further examines a variety of masque treatments of public-centered themes. In 1613, a Caversham entertainment questions public versus private life. *The World Tossed at Tennis* (1620) stages proscriptive virtues for the “civic business of public culture” (198). *Fancy’s Festivals* (1657) exploits the tensions and nuances between aesthetics and politics (202). Milton’s Ludlow masque interrogates subversions and the culture’s procedures for codifying information. In light of these examples, Shohet asserts the masque as a form that accommodates the discourses and events rendered by the culture that produces them. Later seventeenth-century masques by William Davenant, John Crown, and John Dryden inflect her deeply researched
and compelling argument: the masque enabled a sustained theatrical tradition.

Shohet’s Conclusion discusses *A New Masque Called the Druids* (1774), which echoes Jonson’s 1606 *Hymenaei*, and explores masques adapted from Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, and *The Tempest* in ways that crystallized the form’s capacious drawing upon the past and its use in the present. Adaptability constitutes the performance, circulation, and dissemination of masques, and “precisely what makes aesthetics a medium of full historical participation” (242).

*Reading Masques* explores the engagement of masques in its private culture and within its public reception. Seventeenth-century scholars of history, politics, social life, and theatre will value the contextual grounding and contemporary specificity Shohet illuminates. Genre enthusiasts will appreciate the argument for masques as contributing to the national dramatic canon.


It is arresting to be asked to review a Festschrift dedicated to a former student, most of the contributors to which, having been my students or colleagues, have also become distinguished specialists. The present volume attests to both the accomplishments of the distinguished seventeenth-century specialist Frank Sysyn, which are considerable (see below), and to the efflorescence of Ukrainian Studies at Harvard in the 1970s and 1980s, when the majority of contributors were present in Cambridge.

The spiritus movens of Ukrainian studies at the time was Professor Omeljan Pritsak, who was invited to Cambridge by the distinguished Iranist, Professor Richard Nelson Frye. Frye, having known Pritsak as editor of the *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, discerned his merits and persuaded the sitting Dean, Franklin Ford, to invite him. Frye’s hunch was not frivolous: Pritsak proved to be a colossal dynamo, and the