

College. Milton soon readies himself to express “some naked thoughts that rove about / And loudly knock to have their passage out” (quoted in Prawdzik 27). This stage performance, Prawdzik explains, feminizes the poet (31) and thereby places him in a transsexual subject position (32), one that arises from the “ambiguous intertwining of flesh and the forces [of desire] that move it” (33). The public spectacle of the poet’s transsexual body threatens his identity even as it lends him authorial power:

Milton locates the menace that attends theatricality in the genitals themselves, the epicentre of the possibly exposed. As the source of reproductive power and as the anchor of gendered identity, they are, as well, a sign of poetic authority. In the negotiations of the theatricalised rhetorical situation, the genitals are a locus of shape-shifting and of potential castration. (35)

Those of us who are unable to find any genitals in this early poem might question Prawdzik’s analysis, but we can still learn much from him about Milton’s struggle to negotiate his identity under the “hostile gaze felt to issue from a social body, a panoptic God, or the conscience or superego” (35). This is the work of a bold scholar, willing to take imaginative risks, and eager to bring Milton into new realms of literary criticism and theory that have too often left him behind.

J. Caitlin Finlayson & Amrita Sen, eds. *Civic Performance: Pageantry and Entertainments in Early Modern England*. London & New York: Routledge, 2020. xiv + 254 pp. 8 illustrations. Review by J. P. CONLAN, UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO, RIO PIEDRAS CAMPUS.

Taken on its own terms, J. Caitlin Finlayson’s & Amrita Sen’s edited collection of eleven essays on Civic Performance puts in competition three strategies of organization for volumes on civic pageant: “Civic to Global,” “Material Encounters,” and “Methodologies for Re-Viewing Performance.” The division into three parts implicitly asks the reader, by way of representative samples, which of these schemes of organization produces a collection that hangs together best. From the outset, though, the three-part division of the volume obfuscates that, under the rubric of civil pageantry, the collection treats two very different

genres of occasional drama that were staged in the city streets: the Lord Mayor's Show, which is occasional drama supplemented by architectural forms aimed at celebrating a particular Lord Mayor's installation, and the Joyous Entry, an occasional drama supplemented by architectural forms that cast in epideictic form a city's or contingent's metaphoric expression of homage to the City's governing prince.

Of the essays that discuss the Lord Mayor's show, the jewel of the collection is chapter 5, Ian W. Archer's "The social and political dynamics of the Lord Mayor's Show, c. 1550–1700" (93–115).

Taking issue with the restrictive focus of REED on reporting the mere dramatic elements of the Lord Mayor's Shows, Archer privileges contemporaneous reception evidence to highlight the importance of what generally has been pushed to the margins but was of crucial significance to the success of the ceremonies celebrating the Lord Mayor's installation. Among these features generally overlooked in the study of the Lord Mayor's Shows, Archer illustrates, are questions of precedence in the procession, ceremonial feasting, the dressing of the poor and issues of funding, the execution of which was at least as important to the received success of the celebration as the dramatic enactments and architectural dimensions informing the Lord Mayor's shows themselves.

Of the essays that discuss Joyous Entries, the finest scholarship can be found in the related cluster of three essays near the end of the volume, chapters 8 to 10, which touch on different aspects of James VI's 1604 Joyous Entry into London:

In chapter 8, "The Duke of Lennox and civic entertainments" (157–175), David Bergeron discusses the entrance and other civic performances from the point of view of James's favorite, Ludovic Stuart, Duke of Lennox. Bergeron highlights that Lennox was an important figure in the world of Stuart civic pageants and entertainments; Lennox had helped arrange the Joyous Entry of King James and Queen Anne into Edinburgh in 1590; when in England, Lennox was one of the very few noblemen outside of the royal family who had a playing company under his command. Lennox not only sponsored George Chapman, but he also danced in Jonson's masques. Not surprisingly, Lennox also accompanied James and Anne as part of their entourage in their Joyous Entry into London in 1604. Bergeron's narration of the

Earl of Lennox's experience gives the reader a street-level experience of what this nobleman and likely, thereby, the King must have seen on this occasion. Welcome digressions detailing what Lennox might have seen on other occasions throughout James I's English reign vest the readers in a sense of the cultural richness that the well-connected such as Lennox must have felt experiencing various types of civic pageants year after year.

Bergeron's account of Lennox's experiences prepares the reader well for the deep dive in chapter 9, "Stephen Harrison's *The Arches of Triumph* (1604) and James I's royal entry in the London literary marketplace" (176–199). Relying on Harrison's own printed illustrations and Jonson's and Dekker's conflicting contemporaneous written accounts, Finlayson details the visual aspects of the 1604 royal entry's seven arches, five of which Harrison designed himself. As it happens, Harrison left accurate dimensions of none of these arches in the Folio he printed afterwards, presumably for the city's governing merchant class (181). It perhaps need not be pointed out that members of Harrison's intended audience were already elite readers in that they had already paid for the arches' fabrication in conformity with prior plans and had personally already experienced the scale of them themselves. The essay speaks both to the specifics of the architecture and artistic design and the style whereby literary commendation and book culture were used to keep the memory of the dismantled triumphal arches alive.

Chapter 10, "Musical Transformations of the city soundscape: King James I's entry into London in 1604" (200–218), beautifully complements the prior two essays: Katherine Butler reminds the audience that the aural elements of the procession, within its cheering, trumpets and drums, now lost to us, had an immediate effect on the aesthetics of the occasion. Of the three essays in this cluster, however, Butler's essay is somewhat less successful. In part the mediated success arises because evidence is lacking: the music, likely improvised drums and trumpets, aurally learned, was not published, and all the reader has to go on are accounts by Jonson, Dugdale, and Dekker, and only the latter "pays sustained attention to the music" (202), in copying out the lyrics to five songs. In part, however, the success of the essay is compromised by a potential overreaching of the evidence: Butler

presumes that Harrison's artistic renditions of musicians and instruments on the arches signal which sort of music was played where.

A further problem of contextualization arises in the discussion of the greeting of James at the Arch of Fame, where Butler presumes that the author of the pageant merely honors a universal trope in addressing the King of Great Britain as a type of Apollo. The compliment is unquestionably more personal to the king: King James VI of Scotland was himself a poet who lay down rules of prosody in *Essayes of a Prentise* (Edinburgh, 1585). Indeed, his own efforts at sonnet writing as King of Scotland is likely the direct font of inspiration for the sonnet pattern most commonly today known as "English" and "Shakespearean" because his most famous Groom of the Chamber imitated his master's form.

The rest of the essays in the collection are a mixed bag; valuable information can be found in each of them, but often, because of the scholar's focus on cataloguing specific tropes and figures in the representations, rhetorical intentions of the makers are ignored, and conclusions about contemporaneous meaning are improperly reached or not reached at all.

In the first chapter, "To the Honour of our Nation abroad': The merchant as adventurer in civic pageantry" (13–31), Tracey Hill challenges the Neoliberal presumption that "[t]he pageantry associated with the installation of the chief officer of the city in the early modern period ... [served] to glamorize and praise the mercantile endeavours that underpinned the wealth of the city's oligarchs, and to trumpet their every wider global reach" (13). After laying out in great detail that Lord Mayors Thomas Smith, Maurice Abbot, Christopher Clitherow, William Cockayne, John Watts, Henry Garway, Hugh Hammersly, John Spencer, Richard Deane, Thomas Middleton, Leonard Holliday, John Swinnerton, Thomas Hayes, John Leman, George Bowles, Francis Barkham, John Gore, and James Campbell were high-ranking members or shareholders in the East India Company, and that some of these and other Lord Mayors invested in the Levant Company and the Muscovy Company, Hill's analysis takes a unfortunate turn; focusing on the figure of the merchant adventurer within a large number of pageants, Hill argues the representation ambiguous, referencing, on the one hand, the city merchants' mission in pageants that "attempted

to link mercantile and spiritual endeavours" (17), and, on the other, a geographic lack of precision that, in Hill's opinion, "mimicked a prevalent indifference within the population at large to those places that were the source of that wealth" (26). To prove the "prevalent indifference" of the pageant's use of "exotic color" (26), Hill cites to various errors in the pageants: Munday's reference to goldsmith's precious metals coming from India in *Chrusothriambos* (25); Tumanama a sixteenth-century Caribbean king rather than a queen (25); Middleton's use of 'Moors' to stand in for 'eastern' nations in *The Tryumphs of Truth* (24); and *The Tryumphes of Peace* misplacing of a branch of a nutmeg tree in the headdress of the figure of Africa (25).

Far more revelatory of the complimentary appeal of these civic performances would this analysis have been had Hill presumed a rhetorical rather than a mimetic purpose for the errors in these Lord Mayors' Shows; quoting to the opening epistle of Richard Willes's *The Travailes of the English in the East and West Indies* (London, 1577), Hill might have demonstrated that geography was the most important field of knowledge of the age, and, once shown, Hill might easily have demonstrated that these Lord Mayors' Shows with their deliberate misrepresentations of product origins in the world aimed at and served to differentiate the London public audience into groups of elite and naïve knowers on the basis of their ability to discern accurate representations of geography from fictional travelers' tales. Into the group of the elite, most obviously, would have been the Lord Mayors with their extensive experience in London's several trading companies. Certainly they, unlike those Londoners unlearned in geography, would have recognized the pageants' misrepresentations off the bat.

Lack of attention to the knowledge of audience-addressed rhetoric also troubles the analysis in chapter 2, "Locating the rhinoceros and the Indian: Strangers, trade and the East India Company in Thomas Heywood's *Porta Pietatis*" (32–34), where Amrita Sen argues that Heywood's *Porta Pietatis* juxtaposes a shepherd with his sheep and an East Indian with a rhinoceros so "as to respond to a moment of an uneasy transition to a more globalized economy that made itself felt both in terms of changing markets and the arrival of new demographic groups in London" (33). Unfortunately, Sen wholly neglects the importance of Thomas Heywood's epistle to Maurice Abbot that

opens the published pageant, in which Heywood addresses the new Lord Mayor not only as a tradesman, which certainly he was, but more specifically and personally as the son of the late Archbishop of Canterbury George Abbot. As it happens, George Abbot taught geography at Saint Mary's College in Oxford University, served as Vice Chancellor of that University several times, and acquitted himself well as Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry and Bishop of London before King James appointed him Archbishop of Canterbury on 4 March 1611.

Omitting any consideration of the opening epistle other than mentioning Maurice Abbot's name, Sen neglects to contextualize the celebration of Maurice Abbot in *Porta Pietatis* against the intellectual legacy that the Archbishop George Abbot left his son. This intellectual legacy included sundry theological and academic publications, including the geographical text taught at Oxford since Elizabeth's time, *A Briefe Description of the Whole World* (in its fifth edition by 1620). So contextualized, the pageant develops in its several shows as a progressive compliment to this Lord Mayor, the son of a geographically knowledgeable Archbishop, that moves from pagan prophet Proteus to a humble shepherd with his useful sheep, from an Indian keeping his rhino that is fierce against predators to the remarks an English seaman appreciative of his City's Lord, finally, to the Christian Citadel in which dwells the figure of Piety, London's Lady seneschal under the command, presumably of this newly installed Lord Mayor, Maurice Abbot, whose paternal heritage and former occupancy of Lambeth Palace ensures that London, in its trade abroad, operates to advance the City of God.

Casual reading of *Porta Pietatis* shows that Heywood hammers home the moral of the pageant in the Speech at Night that concludes it. According to the prophet Proteus, the shepherd is useful, the rhinoceros is protective, the merchant achieves status by his trade, "But," under this particular Lord Mayor's guidance, like a lighthouse or a compass, "*Piety* doth point You to that Starre, / By which good Merchants steere."

The final two chapters of the first section, which consider three different Joyous Entries, betray similar flaws in focus: in the search for figural significance on a completely mimetic plane, the City's interest in defining its interests to its prince, which the Joyous Entries

presumptively defined in metaphoric terms, is never even discussed.

In chapter three, for instance, entitled, “Cleopatra in Her Barge’: Anne Boleyn’s coronation pageants and the production of English cultural capital,” (50–69), Sarah Crover concerns herself with the extent that Anne’s coronation pageant imitated or exceeded the coronation pageants of past queens Catherine of Aragon and Elizabeth of York. Lost in this comparison is the topical meaning of the event. In problematizing Cleopatra and Venus as mythically seductive figures that led men to their deaths and focusing only on Anne’s pregnancy, Crover overlooks what Anne Boleyn’s marriage to Henry VIII meant for London City trade. Had Crover altered her focus toward the rhetoric, Crover might have shown how Queen Anne Boleyn’s favorable reception by London as a type of Cleopatra or Cyprian Venus, who first travelled over the water into London and then who was then led overland into London by a procession of twelve Frenchmen to be received by Henry VIII, implicitly complimented Henry as a type of Caesar whose subjects’ claims to free commerce with Africa or trade in the Levant or excursions in the West Indies neither the bishop of Rome, rejected by the reception of Anne Boleyn as Henry’s wife, nor the King of Spain and Holy Roman Emperor, undoubtedly offended by Anne’s use of Catherine of Aragon’s own barge, would be allowed jurisdiction at admiralty to preclude.

Similarly incomplete is chapter 4, entitled, “The Unspoken language of aliens, or the Spectacular conversation between visiting English and Dutch that transcended time and space” (70–89). Certainly, Nancy Kay recognizes that

The cost of a typical early modern royal entry was enormous and, for the most part, was assumed by the municipal government and guilds the host city, [and] [i]n exchange, these cities were granted the rare opportunity to present their royal guest with their most urgent concerns in the form of public entertainments” (70, rehearsing citations).

But still, in her attempt to put into meaningful conversation with each other a pageant performed by English merchants in Antwerp at the Joyous Entry of Philip of Antwerp in 1549 and the Dutch pageant performed in London at the Joyous Entry of King James I in 1604, Kay focuses exclusively on imagery and pageant architecture to the

exclusion of what specific rights and privileges each contingent of alien merchants wished the sovereign to confirm on each occasion. The warrant for this omission is neither historically nor etymologically sound. The very term “joyous entry” means the first official peaceable visit of the ruling prince at which time, typically, the rights of the city and entities within the city were confirmed and extended.

Kay’s discussion of the Joyous Entry in 1549 details how the English merchants in Antwerp invoke the British origins of the Holy Roman Empire in Constantine and Saint Helen through their late descendant Henry VIII, (though succeeded by Edward VI) and highlights the common enemy in the Turk. Nonetheless, staying strictly within a formalist mode in which only the representation is the object of study, Kay neglects the contemporaneous rhetorical context that informed the intent of the expenditures and design and, presumably, within which these pageants were understood by the Princes before whom they were presented. That is, Kay provides no sense of the international tensions or reversals of foreign policies that might dissuade Philip of Antwerp from extending the rights and privileges of English aliens in this City, nor does Kay even indicate what these privileges were. The reader thereby derives no understanding of what actually was at stake when these English aliens, now subjects of King Edward VI, invested such time, treasure and industry in staging a pageant for Prince Philip that alluded to the British origins of the Holy Roman Empire that Philip was destined to inherit.

The omission of the specific context of communication between alien and sovereign becomes all the more glaring as Kay moves on to discussing James’s Joyous Entry into London in 1604. Certainly, Kay describes the Dutch contribution of an arch to the Joyous Entry in all of its imagery, a feature that links this Kay’s contribution to chapters 8, 9 and 10. However, toward the end of suggesting that “[t]he time and space between the entry of Philip in 1549 and that of James in 1604 begin to collapse when one realizes the web of dynastic interconnections that these two arches and their corresponding events represent” (77), Kay omits to note the very important fact of reception that, in his 1604 Joyous Entry, James rode past the Dutch display, staring straight ahead, without slowing down even to look at it. Despite the elaborate Flemish panels, despite his and his wife’s well-documented

respect for Flemish painters, James in his Joyous Entry into London paid no mind either to the Dutch actors' pleadings representing themselves as orphans living in exile, nor to the sumptuous works of art that the Dutch had invested so much money, time and thought in creating, presumably so as to persuade James to advance their cause.

In chapter 7, "Financial Encounter Customs: Tradition and Form in London's Civic Pageantry" (138–53), Jill Ingraham focuses on the trope of gift-giving. Certainly, gift-giving is an important feature of many entertainments and civic ceremonies that help articulate in concrete terms the relationship of the city to the person who is being honored. And Ingraham includes much interesting information in the piece about gifts given in Elizabethan and Jacobean shows. In this essay, however, Ingraham focuses her attention on (a) two of Anthony Munday's Lord Mayors' Shows performed in 1605 and 1611, (b) the Joyous Entry of Prince Henry into London in 1610 and (c) Ben Jonson's private entertainment for King James and Queen Anne at the House of William Cornwallis at Highgate in 1604. The analysis is not particularly rigorous, nor does it appear to be set up to be. Generically, Lord Mayor Show, Joyous Entry and Masque use gift-giving differently. These differences are not discussed. Belying the materialist focus of the section, two of these performances—Prince Henry's Joyous Entry and the Highgate entertainment—stage no giving of tangible objects at all. Corinea in *London's Love* offers Prince Henry the City's "boundless love," and May in Jonson's masque offers the promise of future gifts.

Finally, Ingraham stops short of identifying the real giver in the Lord Mayor's Show of 1605, Anthony Munday's *Triumphs of a Re-united Britain*, dedicated to Lord Sir Leonard Holliday of the Merchant Taylors, where the gift-giving constitutes a random scattering into the watching public of imported pepper, cloves and mace. Presumably, these spices were paid for prior to the performance. But Ingraham never clarifies whether the spices were purchased with public funds, whether they were paid for out of Holliday's own pocket, or whether the East India Company donated the spices to the performance, so it never becomes clear whether the so-called unity advertised in Munday's title for this Lord Mayor's Show derives from Holliday's own largesse, his willingness to use municipal moneys to subsidize East India Company merchants, or the East India Company's enthusiastic

support of his candidacy against a less well-liked contender. Because of Ingraham's oversight, the meaning of Munday's title—and perhaps the origins of the city fathers' preference for Munday over Middleton—never comes to light.

The final essay of the collection, chapter 11, "Building a Digital Geospatial Anthology of the Mayoral Shows," (219–238), appears to the reader as a breath of fresh air. The essays in general are largely ambitious for the reader, requiring that the reader have full knowledge of the entertainments and sites within London in which they were played to make sense of them. Shifting back and forth between time and space to consider specific tropes that appear in one pageant or another within the ten prior essays presents a daunting task on the first reading, and the promise of an electronic digital edition that allows Lord Mayors' Shows to be overlain one atop the other in their place in London town tenders to the exhausted reader initially a promise of relief in bringing the already published editions of Lord Mayors' Shows and civic pageants in one place, and, simultaneously allowing scholars to "drill down" based on the specific urban space in the London streets.

The value of the promised electronic edition, of course, depends on the execution. Enthusiastic assertions that "our editions of the memorial Shows promises to bring users closer to the original performances by documenting the events beyond the book and relocalising the Shows in London's streets," and "MoEML's technologies allow us to arrive at a closer approximation of these performances and processions by breaking the book and looking outside of the linguistic codes for materials and records that also bear witness to these previously inaccessible ceremonies" (220), suggest something approaching Peter Quill's holographic projection on Morad at the opening of *Guardians of the Galaxy* rather than the hypertext coding and document stacks that the electronic edition, attaching sites of pageant arches to the Map of Early Modern London, will likely provide. All hyperbole aside, the publication of all of the Lord Mayors' Shows and London civic pageants in one place, attached to a map of Early Modern London, is likely to be useful, at least in providing easy widespread access to the visual and verbal context of works, frequently considered ephemeral, that certainly informed the literary, political, and artistic culture of the time.

In many ways, this collection is useful in the same way. Regardless of the flaws in argumentation, each chapter has extensive notes and a bibliography of several pages. The essays explore many different pageants in many different ways. Each essay provokes thinking on material that, in Early Modern literature classes, is generally not deemed canonical. And each scholar engages with his or her material seriously, lending the study of civic performance, whether Lord Mayors' Shows or Joyous Entries, a *gravitas* that the material may not have enjoyed before. The strength of the collection is that it offers grist for further analysis all in one place. In that way, *Civic Performance: Pageantry and Entertainments in Early Modern England* constitutes a welcome contribution to the field.

Chanita Goodblatt. *Jewish and Christian Voices in English Reformation Drama: Enacting Family and Monarchy*. London: Routledge, 2018. xiii + 256 pp. \$155.00. Review by DARRYL TIPPENS, ABILENE CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY.

Professor Goodblatt's study is an exercise in intertextuality in which the author considers the "reciprocal illumination" of the Bible, various "exegetical" and political texts, and three biblically based dramas written and performed in sixteenth-century England. These plays, according to Goodblatt, are rich in political and religious meanings when read within the elaborate sign systems involving a variety of Jewish and Christian "voices" that include sixteenth-century translations of the Bible, Bible commentaries, sermons, political documents, diaries, biblical epic, and Medieval and Early Modern plays. This intertextual approach to the drama of the English Reformation raises important questions about family, gender, and monarchy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The expansive range of texts considered in the study is its signature feature and its central challenge.

The book focuses on three dramas: *The Enterlude of Godly Queene Hester* (1561), *The Historie of Jacob and Esau* (1568), and George Peele's *The Love of King David and Fair Bethsabe, with the Tragedie of Absalon* (1599). Viewing these three plays as "exegetical and performative response[s] to the Bible," Goodblatt aims to answer these questions: