

scène, in other words, in the invention of the concept of the painting to designate all representation, pictorial or theatrical. This double invention of the painting-stage and of the stage-painting introduces a certain number of ruptures in the concept of representation, ruptures which are probably not confirmed completely until Diderot's century. The most obvious are the divorce between the representation and the public, the naming of the object-painting and the object-stage, or even the substitution of a relationship of separation (if not of distance) with a relationship of participation which prevailed in religious imagery. Another field to be explored, also at Hénin's suggestion, is the reception of a representation, which plays an important role in the formation of classical theory.

Hénin explains that her book, out of concern for coherence, has deliberately left out the debates on the purgation of the passions, even though this notion plays the role of final causality in representation. And lastly, she affirms, only a mastery of these debates will allow one to understand the Renaissance and classical conceptions of the role of the actor. We agree with Hénin; the book is an indisputable classic. She has given us the gift of an invaluable survey and an ingenious methodology: art and theatre historians should now borrow from and continue the in-depth study of *Ut Pictura Theatrum*.

T. R. Langley. *Image Government: Monarchical Metamorphoses in English Literature and Art*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2001. 256 pp. + 6 illus. Review by STEPHEN GLEISSNER, WICHITA ART MUSEUM.

Langley's study of transformations in the imagery of power in seventeenth-century England departs from two scholarly articles written more than a generation ago: E. R. Wasserman's "Nature Moralized: Divine Analogy in the Eighteenth Century," *EHL*, 20, 1953 and Edgar Wind's "Julian the Apostate at Hampton Court," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 3, 1939-40. Wasserman asserted that prior to the Restoration of 1660, images of authority, particularly those of kingship, were perceived in the same manner as they had been since the Elizabethan period: analogically. Thus, when a ruler was compared with the sun, the audience assumed a palpable similitude or correspondence between the two so that one could be substituted for the other. The imagery of the Tudor and Early Stuart monarchs, thinks Langley (through Wasserman), was imbued with a sense of dignity and credibility of

an almost incomprehensible degree. Yet by the end of the century, the comparisons made in royal imagery were understood by the viewing/reading audience to be, at best, self-consciously metaphorical—that is, having no actual basis in the subjects compared—or, more likely, fictions of statecraft. Langley sees the production and reception of late seventeenth-century royal imagery as the origin of modern political identity formation and branding.

Few historians would deny Langley's overarching assertion (as described above). Nor would they deny his belief that the years between 1660 and 1687 were critical to the change from analogical representation to self-conscious, cunningly crafted representation. Dissatisfaction with *Image Government* arises when Langley moves to causation. What brought about this change in the general perception and expression of royal identity? Langley believes that partial responsibility lies with the personalities and policies of the Late Stuart monarchs. He also seems, however, to believe that it was an almost inevitable result of a change in the spirit of the times, or, in his words, history moving inexorably in cycles (12). Yes, there were those early skeptics, such as Bacon and Hobbes, who thought that kings ruled through covenant, just as there were nineteenth-century botanists who clung to the old assumptions. But in general, an even wind seems to blow in the new spirit, a wind untroubled by multiple and often conflicting audiences for the literature or art discussed, not to mention the many motivations that lay behind their production.

Image Government is a largely unreadable book not because of its motivating idea, but because of (1) its structure and manner of exposition; and (2) the author's use of written English. Langley writes like a post-structuralist. His structure and style are so open to meaning, and at the same time so opaque to meaning, that the reader is left to make his or her own conclusions. Even the publisher has difficulty summarizing the meaning of the book. The dust jacket synopsis states that "*Image Government* traces some of the cranks and windings, ebbings and flowings that lead from Charles I's downfall to Queen Anne's coronation. . . ." What sort of object of history, one wonders, is an ebb or a flow?

The book begins with a preface and a "Prologue," then divides into two parts of twelve chapters each. The structure of the book vaguely resembles a masque in that there is an ostensible subject surrounded by various independent entertainments. Unfortunately, the structure and tone of each chapter more closely resemble a sermon than an entertainment. No chapter begins

with an introduction, proceeds with a development, or ends with a conclusion. Nor is there a transition to or argument for the movement from one chapter to another.

The main subjects of the book are the writing of Edmund Waller in Part I and the decorative painting of Antonio Verrio in Part II. Neither subject is interpreted in a balanced manner or placed in a broad enough context. Regarding Verrio's murals, for example, too much attention is given to the iconography of Julian the Apostate and too little is given to Verrio's extensive program of decorative paintings for Charles II at Windsor Castle. Is the representation associated with William III at Hampton Court any more self-conscious or deliberate than Verrio's ceiling in the King's Great Bedchamber at Windsor that depicts Louis XIV keeling in submission at the feet of Charles II? A further cost of failing to make the comparison is the opportunity Langley loses to show that, for whatever reason, the iconography associated with William III at Hampton Court is far more complicated and difficult to read than any executed by Verrio for Charles II, yet this could possibly have supported his larger argument.

What makes *Image Government* most unreadable is the author's style. There are few straightforward sentences in the book. The second sentence of the book, for example, includes a three line parenthetical aside and ends with a quotation from Ead Wasserman that in turn quotes Shakespeare. Paragraphs are plagued with quotations from the writings of minor period figures whose significance is insufficiently explained. The following is a typical paragraph:

From the start the number was, as it were, up. "Witchcraft" would win—strenuously pretending, with cries of

Away this Goblin Witchcraft, Priest-craft Prince,

Give us a King, Divine, by Law and Sense,

that it wasn't. This time, too, the spell was to hold good, for good; made all the more binding (witness Howard Nenner's book, so entitled) *By Color of Law*—and, for the first few, difficult years, tincture of Mary. (9)

Frequently, paragraphs are of undecipherable meaning.

What, then, is the appropriate audience for *Image Government*? Certainly not, as the dust jacket claims, students or scholars. The former would never be able to untangle the prose, while the latter would be put off by the author's neglect of the requisite secondary literature. Langley devotes considerable

space to Dryden without reference to James Winn's *John Dryden and His World* (1987). Nor are the important recent studies of English court culture of the period cited, notably *Art and Patronage in the Caroline Courts*, edited by David Howarth (1993) or any of the three books on the subject by R. Malcolm Smuts (1987, 1996, and 1999). The general, well-educated reader would be lost not only in the prose but in the labyrinth of references to minor period figures. The most obvious reader of *Image Government* would be an antiquarian who takes delight in recognizing obscure references. That reader would appreciate Langley's vast and admirable command of the period literature, and would, unlike most of us, be amused to find the significance of the book's title revealed at the end of the last chapter.

Anat Gilboa. *Images of the Feminine in Rembrandt's Work*. Delft: Eburon Publishers, 2003. 241 pp. + 18 black and white figures and 16 color plates. \$35.00. Reviewed by LISA ROSENTHAL, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, URBANA-CHAMPAIGN.

Anat Gilboa's *Images of the Feminine in Rembrandt's Work* speaks to the enduring interest in the art of Rembrandt, attested to by a spate of recent publications including monographs by Stephanie Dickey, Catherine Scallen, and Michael Zell, and catalogues from several exhibitions including *Rembrandt's Journey: Painter, Draftsman, Etcher* (Boston/Chicago 2003-04) and *Rembrandt's Women* (Edinburgh/London 2003), and to the growing literature on the representation of gender in seventeenth-century art. Originally written as a dissertation for the author's doctorate from the Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, Gilboa's book aims to cover a broad array of paintings, prints and drawings while maintaining its organizing focus on Rembrandt's varied and shifting approach to the female figure in his art.

In a brief introductory chapter Gilboa describes her undertaking as a fundamentally iconographic study which seeks to elucidate Rembrandt's "personal and artistic development" (20). This developmental thesis organizes Chapter 1, which provides a chronologically-arranged overview of the diverse kinds of imagery that featured women across the span of Rembrandt's career. The artist's biography, especially regarding his marriage to Saskia van Uylenburgh, and, following her death, his relationship with Hendrickje Stoffels, provides the general framework both for this chapter and for the book as a