that force us to make the leap that he does, that enable us to see what he sees” (3). While these remarks are unimpeachable, they also aptly characterize the “meditative modes” treated earlier in the book. Similarly, Seelig distinguishes the “deconstructive impulse” of Burton and Sterne, claiming that “Both are characterized by excess; each puts forward a form only to undermine it, to tease our expectations, or to manipulate our responses” (5). Both writers cite authority to such excess that authority is undermined by chaotic diversity, and both “play games with the reader, treating him both as partner and as object” (6). True, but the same, of course, could be said of Pseudo-Martyr or Biathanatos, Ulysses, or Ada, to name only a few, generically distinct, works. To speak of genre is at some point to differentiate. Indeed, Seelig distinguishes among her paired texts by making generic distinctions: meditative mode, normative autobiography, etc. But as she examines each of her categories, the contours of genre are replaced by an integration of epistemological systems, formal structures, authorial impulses, strategies, and attitudes. Seelig criticizes Alastair Fowler for his proliferation of generic distinctions, categories, and sub-genres, pointing out that his system “provides too little framework . . . thus destroying the function of genre, which is not only to help understand individual works but also to see them in relation to other works of the same kind” (9). At times, however, Seelig’s generous view of genre and of relations among works over-corrects Fowler’s excess.

Nevertheless, Generating Texts is a valuable contribution to the study of literary form and literary influence. Its governing assertion that ways of seeing the world are determinative of structure is eloquently argued and—more importantly—is borne out by the works of literature under consideration. Always sensitive to the subtle nuances of language and method, Seelig “unpacks” her subject with extraordinary insight and affection.

In Common Prayer, her first book, Targoff studies the everyday practices as well as the ideological underpinnings of public worship. Spanning the Church of England’s first fifty years, the book focuses on the standardization of worship and the relation between the outward performance of prayer and inward piety. Targoff shows that personal religious belief and expression were influenced, and even fundamentally shaped, by the public, “common” rites. First, she counters the belief that Protestantism fostered a new, individualized experience of religion. In her last two chapters, she studies the influence of standardized worship, in the form of the Book of Common Prayer and the Bay Psalm Book, on private devotional expression.

The succinct introduction figures a reading of Claudius’ prayer in Hamlet, which, according to Targoff, reveals “the belief that external practices might not only reflect but also potentially transform the inner self” (3). Thus, for example, the habit of kneeling in prayer was seen as facilitating (and not merely indicating) sincere piety. Consequently, the construction of the Prayer Book in 1549 presented the church fathers with the opportunity to influence the internal religious sentiments of the people. By the seventeenth century “increasingly elaborate accounts of the involuntary correspondence between external and internal states of devotion” (10) surfaced. Prayerful imitation and adaptation of spiritual and secular texts, such as poetry, became common.

Chapter 1 discusses the main differences between the Catholic and Protestant liturgy in England. Targoff argues that the Latin service encouraged believers to pray privately, whereas the Protestant Prayer Book left little room for individual utterance. Apparently, the Protestants feared the “lewd and perverse imaginings” (16) of the laity, and sought to supplant them completely with collective prayers. Considerations of the Catholic Primers and the vernacular Lay Folk’s Mass Book, show that the parishioners’ main activity consisted of “looking up” from personal prayer to the sac-
rament; whereas the Prayer Book demanded complete auditory attention from the audience throughout the entire service. Interestingly, the 1552 revisions changed many first person singular pronouns to plural, making the utterances even more collective. The domestic use of the Prayer Book is viewed by Targoff as evidence of the public paradigm extending into the private sphere, though one could also interpret it as a sign of the re-privatisation of prayer.

Chapter 2 deals with Puritan and other non-conformist objections to the Prayer Book. They argued that the Prayer Book restricted the self-expression of the individual and they also objected to the mandatory use of the Book of Homilies. Because of their emphasis on the sermon, to be delivered by an educated minister, the non-conformists sought to preserve the difference between the laity’s and the clergy’s utterances. Hooker argued in response that the edification of the public was not to take place through the minister’s words but through the internalisation of their “own,” prescribed prayers.

According to Targoff, “the devotional impulses of a liturgical culture interested in generating new texts for corporate worship” (58) led to a great increase in metrical psalm translation in the years following the Edwardian Reformation. The appropriation of poetic forms to liturgical texts is discussed in chapter 3. Though perhaps too much time is spent on medieval versified Psalms, Targoff’s readings of the reformation Psalters and the Sidney-Pembroke Psalter in particular are very insightful. She convincingly shows that poetry was recognized as a legitimate, separate category of devotional practice by the early seventeenth century.

As there was no clear distinction between individual and collective utterance in prayer, devotional lyric was also seen “as a viable form of collective expression” (86). Therefore, Targoff argues, upon their publication, George Herbert’s poems would simply have been read as prayers, which were always public and private at the same time. In this manner, her analysis of Herbert eclipses the distance between public and private or “liturgy and inwardness” (98) in his poetry, that she claims Wordsworth invented, and
Martz and Lewalski respected. The fact that *The Temple* was printed at Cambridge University Press, which at the time specialized in “common” devotional texts, supports the claims for the relationship between Herbert’s poetry and public prayer.

In the conclusion on the *Bay Psalm Book*, Targoff points out that the singing of the metrical Psalms was sanctioned in the non-liturgical world of the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay Colony precisely because of their poetical status, which set them apart from other devotional texts.

In summary, *Common Prayer* is a highly readable book (despite its surprisingly small font!) with chapters that work very well on their own, but even better as a whole. In its explorations of subject-formation and the construction of interiority in post-Reformation England, this book surely stands as one of the most important studies of recent years.


In *Donne, Castiglione, and the Poetry of Courtliness*, Peter DeSa Wiggins addresses the problem of meaning and sincerity in John Donne’s secular poetry by casting Donne as a courtier who used principles of courtly behavior derived from Castiglione to promote his own political career. Wiggins uses the *Satyres* and selected lyrics to demonstrate how Castiglione’s principles are active in Donne’s poetry. By virtue of broad familiarity with Donne scholarship and with the social attitudes of Donne’s day, Wiggins brings new insight to the selected poems while he supports his vision of Donne as a courtier whose political aspirations shaped his behavior as a poet. It may be, as Wiggins claims, that the principles he derives from Castiglione can function as a hermeneutical tool for further analysis of Donne’s poetry.