one Andreini reserved for herself, as her speeches manifest the heroine’s overt feminist inclination. Constituting a cultural moment in tragicomedy development, *La Mirtilla* represents Andreini’s literary talent for her own self-fashioning. Although first trained as a courtesan and later an actress and a playwright, she married Francesco Andreini and exemplified both “humanist and Christian ideals for early modern women, attributes considered unusual for an actress” (xii). Recognized as “one of the greatest *innamorate* in the history of Italian comedy” (xi), she held membership in the academy of Pavia; along with her husband, she co-directed the famous Gelosi theatrical company, thus fashioning her own identity and reputation.

*La Mirtilla*‘s popularity speaks to extensive readership. Italian publication in 1588 generated multiple editions and nine reprints by 1616, and editions were printed in Paris; however, there are no extant manuscripts of *La Mirtilla*. Campbell based her translation upon Maria Luisa Doglio’s 1995 edition, which deviated from the 1588 edition by modernizing Italian spelling and regularizing capitalization but retained the edition’s line breaks and line numbers. She accomplishes her goal, to “render a text that is a close translation of Andreini’s vocabulary, being mindful of her sixteenth-century idiom, while at the same time producing an easily readable, standard English text, suitable for use in the college classroom” (xxvi). Campbell’s attractive and accessible *La Mirtilla* enlarges the scope of Renaissance scholarship, provides a welcome addition to the pastoral, women’s studies, and the drama canon, and it brings a successful, although lesser-studied author, to new readership.


Joyce Green MacDonald’s *Women and Race in Early Modern Texts* deals with a broad range of material having to do with representations of African women in primary material from the late
fourteenth century to the Restoration. The book begins with a chapter on late twentieth-century critical race theory and early modern representations of Cleopatra and then moves to a discussion of Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, a consideration of the two women of Carthage—Dido—and Sophonisba, two chapters on Aphra Behn's *Oronooko* and its subsequent adaptations, a piece on Katherine Philips' translation of Corneille's *La Mort de Pompée*, and, finally, a reading of Behn's seldom-studied *Abdelazer*. The phrase that might most come to mind is “casting a wide net” but the phrase would be inaccurate, for while MacDonald characterizes the book as a monograph in her introduction, a reader expecting a single “net” that pulls the fairly disparate material together into a coherent argument is likely to be disappointed.

Of the seven chapters of the book, four were originally published as journal articles, a fact which would not be at all remarkable except for the fact that the chapters of this book feel remarkably discrete. Indeed, in the places in the book where MacDonald attempts to bring together the chapters' various arguments, the thinking is often careless and at best provisional. For example, introducing the Restoration texts of the second half of the book MacDonald says, “Instead of the relational bond between Rome and Egypt, Mariam and Salome, Octavia and Cleopatra, Dido and Sophonisba, we see more texts which betray no knowledge of the possibility that female whiteness can produce or be defined by its opposite” (88-89). By “opposite” I suppose she means female blackness, but if she does it is neither clear nor an appropriate significance. (Such lack of care—and the example I’ve cited is but one example of many such instances in the volume—forces one to wonder also at the editorial process behind the book.)

MacDonald's primary concern, as she articulates it in the Introduction, is “with discovering how women’s bodies, white as well as black, and women’s writing identities were ‘taken’ and used by early modern cultures of race and colonialism” (4). The book, she says, “will trace two . . . gendered tactics of communicating empire: the removal of dark-skinned women from representation, and the submersion of Englishwomen’s racial identity into gender” (10).
Given those aims, the reader might quite justifiably anticipate a discussion heavy on cultural and intellectual history: how does the history of the representation of black women participate in a broader history of ideas about English empire and colonialism? More specifically, the organization of the book around two separate narratives designed to contain women’s raced bodies—narratives of Rome's founding and its progress toward Empire, and narratives of Britain’s establishment of colonial authority in the New World—might reasonably lead one to expect a careful, nuanced discussion of the ways in which ideas about race figure in the change in English attitudes toward empire between, say, the late sixteenth century and the early eighteenth centuries. But while the chapters offer some insightful and even surprising readings of texts, the kind of historicizing that is necessary to do the work MacDonald seems to be promising in her introduction is almost completely absent.

For instance, MacDonald writes quite convincingly about the way in which Katherine Philips “chastens” her *Pompey* of racial consciousness: “To acknowledge more fully the play of racial and cultural difference operating in the historical materials which *Pompey* dramatizes would be to acknowledge that gender is not the immutable and indivisible category Philips’ achievement of authorship requires it to be” (133). But while MacDonald’s discussion of this “chastening” is convincing at the level of the text, the expected discussion of the ways in which Philips’ chastened account of Roman civil war might be in conversation with English civil war and ideas about empire never takes place. Instead, the “chaste thinking” (MacDonald borrows the phrase from Stephanie Jed) of *Pompey* has only to do with Philips’ conflicted habitation of literary authority.

One is compelled to make the comparison to the work of John Michael Archer, whose own deeply nuanced, learned work on race in early modern England surely sets the standard for the kind of historicizing that is necessary in making such important arguments. It is work that MacDonald knows: Archer’s fine essay on the relationship between Rome and Egypt—and early modern En-
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gland—in Shakespeare’s *Antony and Cleopatra* was, in fact, first published in a 1997 collection that MacDonald herself edited—*Race, Ethnicity, and Power in the Renaissance* (inexplicably, Archer’s important essay is never even cited by MacDonald).

Still, the book, while it doesn’t live up to its own billing or the historicist expectations this reader brought to it, contains some important arguments. MacDonald’s oft-reiterated assertion that determining race by skin color is a modern and not a Renaissance phenomenon leads to some very insightful, and original, readings of early modern texts that read race in the body and bodily behaviors as well as in social institutions like marriage and the family. My sense is that in this way MacDonald’s work has already opened the field to important reevaluations of race in early modern texts. Furthermore, her discussion of early women writers like Philips and Behn, who she shows to be at best ambivalent about issues of both race and gender, also contributes valuably to other recent work that is providing a much-needed correction to a field that has sometimes devoted too much energy to establishing a female literary tradition and ignored the differences, as MacDonald puts it, “not only between, but sometimes even within women” (148). Yet in the end the book’s methodological weaknesses will mean that *Women and Race in Early Modern Texts* is not likely to have the impact on the field of early modern studies that its capacious title—and its introduction—seems to promise.