to Benveniste, along with histories, critical works, and contemporary theories to inform her close readings. These offer interpretations of the arguments over "This is my body" in the eucharist that issued in Cranmer's reforming codification for the English church, the vestiarian controversy during that same period along with Foxe's presentation of its martyrs, Donne's affirmation in Station XII of *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions*, catachrestic figuration of eroticism in Busirane's palace, and the rhetorical strife between past allegiances and future projections in Gerrard de Malynes's *Lex Mercatoria*. She thereby covers many topics scholars are taking to be focal points for our understanding of early modern English textual culture: the nature of symbolism viewed through understandings of the symbol of the eucharist with the slippages these undergo when passing through multiple languages and faiths, the representations, personal and public, of sexual desire, the shift from faith-based knowledge to rational explanation, the relations between the worlds of matter and of ideas. Anderson's meditations are approached through the mediations of multiple translations, the workings of creative metaphor with its own complex relationship to constricting metonomy.

Other close readers may or may not hear the elevation of register Anderson describes in Donne's *Meditations*, may or may not agree to her characterization of the vehicles that carry Malynes' economic ideas, or the particulars of her explication of some other text. But students need to take her applications into account and attend to her rationale of negotiating between the many overlapping binaries represented by proliferating polysemy and restrictive coded substitutions, theory and history, when we aim at understanding the texts of early modern England and our discipline.

Margo Swiss and David A. Kent, eds. *Speaking Grief in English Literary Culture, Shakespeare to Milton*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne, 2002. x + 365 pp. $60.00. Review by CAROL BARTON.

As one might intuit from its title, *Speaking Grief* is a collection of essays on the sufferer's articulation of, or the condolers' written response to, bereavement, loss, and the grieving process from the late Renaissance through the early Restoration. As were the points of view of the poets with whom the period under scrutiny begins and ends, the collection's perspective is Janus-

like, looking backward toward a time when mourning was considered an affront to grace, "a tacit denial of faith in salvation and resurrection," to use Fred B. Tromly's term (n3, 307), and forward, to the modern sensibilities that encourage the public expression of sorrow. The latter recognizes, as the former did not, that "God's grace act[ing] on the soul distressed by bereavement … transformed a loss into a blessing," so that "[c]hastened, cast down, then lifted up by God's hand, some felt ultimately strengthened by the losses they had endured" (Houlbrooke, cited by Swiss and Kent, 10-11).

Originating from a special session organized for the Modern Language Association's annual convention in Toronto, Canada in 1997 ("Grief Expression in Seventeenth-Century English Literary Culture"), the volume consists of an Introduction, twelve essays, and a thoughtfully written and very descriptive interdisciplinary overview in the form of an Afterword by historian Ralph Houlbrooke–365 pages in all (including end matter). Poignantly, *Speaking Grief* is dedicated "by the unanimous wish of all the contributors" to one of their number, the late Professor Louis L. Martz, who died before the collection could reach print; it is thus a book of mourning, about mourning, written by those whose experience of bereavement is fresh.

Organized in rough chronology (with some necessary overlap) and relying prodigiously on G. W. Pigman's *Grief and English Renaissance Elegy* (Cambridge, 1985), Houlbrooke's *Death, Ritual, and Bereavement* (Routledge 1989), and Anne Laurence's "Godly grief: individual responses to death in seventeenth century Britain" (an essay within the latter volume), the analyses in *Speaking Grief* juxtapose "the stoical counsel to suppress grief…widely disseminated during the sixteenth century" (2), with its tendency to view the effects of bereavement as "a potentially fatal affliction … that could send people mad" (5), to "the greater freedom to express grief in writing in early seventeenth century culture" (8) emanating at least in part from the recognition that "God himself had grieved," and "that Christ was "*vir dolorum* [a man of sorrows]." In an age in which the challenges to life expectancy included not only widespread privation, improper hygiene and worse sanitation, inept or misguided health care, dysentery, typhoid, and high infant mortality, but bubonic plague, the Great Fire, and three civil wars as well, the experience of bereavement was nearly universal, and the "appeal to emotional rigor" (8) an increasingly ineffectual one. The tears of the Saviour in John 11:35, Luke 19:41, and Hebrews 5:7 provided the counterargument that "served to legitimize the

occasional grieving of Christians themselves"–with the aid of more and more widespread acknowledgment of the fact that "articulating complicated feelings of personal loss could temper the heartache of sorrow and ease the bereaved through a gradual procedure of healing and acceptance of loss" (9).

Nonetheless, the "speaking of grief" was predictably not without its politics: gender- and class-based perceptions of the legitimacy of mourning further complicated the issue, so that "despite the topos that death is a leveler of social differences … the office of consoling [was] usually discharged by a person higher on the social hierarchy than–or at the very least a peer of–the person being comforted" (26). As Tromly suggests, "at the core of the ancient tradition [was] a stoical hierarchy with manliness and rationality at the top and effeminate, slavish grief at the bottom, suggesting that the consoler is to the consoled as reason is to passion, or as man is to woman and child" (25). Likewise, the corollary perception that "a woman's lament, grievance, or suffering … [was] the 'everyday' plight of the common [wo]man, a quotidian event whose collective force [did] not seem to bear the same weight of 'seriousness' as a man's grief" (15) led female elegists like Mary Carey, Lucy Hastings, Alice Thornton, and Gertrude Thimelby to "challenge the stereotypical view of [women's] emotionally unbalanced nature," and provoked An Collins to adopt "a prophetical persona and [transform] personal grief into a political lament for England in the 1650s" (18). Such "gendering of grief" may even have led poets like Shakespeare, Milton, and Marvell to speak their grief most eloquently through the lips of female characters (most notably, Cordelia, Eve, and the "complaining" Nymph, all of whom are subjects of the essays in this collection).

A further complication of the relaxation of earlier strictures against the vocalization of sorrow involves challenges to the sincerity of the emotions being expressed: does one offer consolation or write an elegy "to assuage grief," or "to cheat death" (18), to "overcome the subjectivity of sorrow" (26) or to articulate "a hostility only thinly veiled as comfort" (28)? It is precisely "the problematic nature of writing grief, its solemnity, indeed the sacredness of its subject," say Swiss and Kent, that "makes it characteristically self-reflexive, often explicitly addressing concerns with its own legitimacy"–a variation on the theme of Herbert's "Wreath" and Marvell's "Coronet," leading to the question "how and why is an authentically sincere lament com-

posed?" (17). Contributors Fred B. Tromly, Robert C. Evans, Marjory E. Lange, Michael McClintock, Louis L. Martz, John T. Shawcross, Donna J. Long, W. Scott Howard, P.G. Stanwood, Paul Parrish, Phillip McCaffrey, and Margo Swiss have worked valiantly to provide an array of carefully considered responses. With respect for the journal's limitations of space and apologies to the authors of essays thus omitted, this review will address only four of the most representative ones.

In "Grief, Authority, and Resistance to Consolation," the first of the collection, Tromly deftly lays the infrastructure on which the essays that follow will be based, arguing that "the resistance to solace in Shakespeare"–such as Leonato's indignant rejection of his brother's "consoling" words in Act V of *Much Ado About Nothing*, or Hamlet's imperviousness to the expressions of "comfort" offered him by his mother and uncle-stepfather–"can be contextualized in broad historical terms as a chapter in the much larger story of how mourning for the dead was gradually legitimated in late Elizabethan England after having been proscribed by man as un-Christian" (21). As Tromly demonstrates, there was considerable precedent in biblical and classical literature for resisting consolation and a good deal more in contemporary fiction and prose (so that, with an interesting twist, Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* would demonstrate that it was only the main character's repudiation of the "solace" offered by Despair that saved his soul). Though Shakespeare thus did not invent the motif, Tromly posits that the frequency with which "consolation resisted" occurs in his works makes it "central to the tensions between authoritative precept and individual percept that animate his art" (22). Taken out of context, for example, Leonato's assertion of paternal grief over the attacks on Hero's honor argues plausibly that "the ability to 'speak comfort' is in fact predicated on the absence of true fellow-feeling" (and as such resembles Romeo's retort to Mercutio that "he jests at scars that never felt a wound" in *Romeo and Juliet* 2:2):

> … 'tis all men's office to speak patience
> To those that wring under the load of sorrow,
> But no man's virtue or sufficiency
> To be so moral when he shall endure
> The like himself …

Likewise, as Tromly points out, Proteus' response to Valentine's grief over his banishment from Verona in *Two Gentlemen* is an equally potent ex-

ample of "how frequently consolatory discourse involves the deception of the person being comforted" in Shakespeare's plays–"What Proteus neglects to mention … is that he is himself in love with Silvia and has in fact brought about his friend's banishment." This double-edged "dark side of consolation's moon," on the one hand that which addresses the insincerity of consolation offered by one who does not suffer, and on the other "the dangerous control that the giver of comfort can all too easily wield over the needy person who suffers" (24-25), is at the core of the classic distrust of consolation's putative healing powers.

The most compelling aspect of Tromly's argument is his treatment of *King Lear,* which is to his mind "Shakespeare's most powerful representation of grief and also his most probing study of the methods and motives of consolation" (32). In this play, "recognizing how hard true sorrow hits, the comforters"–and there are many of them–"seem to sense that verbal formulas are not adequate, that such enormous grief cannot be patched with proverbs. As a consequence, they forfeit their privilege and enter the storm of suffering in an attempt to convey a comfort that is substantial rather than merely verbal," agonizingly empathetic rather than superficially sympathetic. "In an attempt to console Lear," for example, "Gloucester risks and very nearly loses his life" (33), and the Fool huddles amid the "cataracts and hurricanoes" with his "Nuncle" on the heath (3.2.2). By contrast, "what is most remarkable" about the reunion between Lear and his youngest daughter (4.7) "is how few words Cordelia speaks" (39): "Indeed, the sense of shared grief is so strong in the scene that the roles of comforter and comforted become fused and the conventional hierarchies dissolved" (40).

Marjory Lange's informative treatment of "Humorous Grief" has nothing to do with humor and everything to do with melancholia, "a disease of madness characterized by delusion, inner disorder, even despair, and manifesting symptoms across the entire spectrum of human behavior … 'a kind of dotage without a fever" (in Robert Burton's words) "having for his ordinary companions fear and sadness, without any apparent occasion'" (70). Reinforcing the class-based perception of mourning, Lange observes that "Lawrence Babb refers to melancholy as a disease 'fashionable' in the Renaissance, not only as a posture in literature, but as an ailment among the gentry"–"The same symptoms of illness would likely be called 'melancholy' in a person of nobility, and 'mopishness' in a person without rank" (75):

> One of the most challenging cruxes in sorting out Renaissance melancholy lies in assessing the man of melancholic complexion–was he insane, or a genius? The controversy explains the eagerness with which many claimed to be melancholy, something that otherwise seems unaccountable. (79)

Continuing the dialogue concerning the potential for disingenuousness in matters consolatory, John T. Shawcross' essay on William Hammond (1614-?), possibly matriculated at St. John's College, Cambridge at Easter in 1627, is characteristically erudite and provocative, while at the same time providing merited acknowledgment of a minor Caroline poet whose work was (regrettably) dismissed by Douglas Bush in 1962 as "not distinctive" (n3, 326)–and by the New DNB as having "little sparkle." In a poetic sequence written to console his elder sister Margaret on the occasion of the drowning of her young husband, Henry (1604-1640)–eldest son of Sir Edwin Sandys of Northbourne, and nephew of the poet, George Sandys–Hammond neither denies nor diminishes the grief she feels, but gently and movingly urges constrained acceptance of the inevitable. Tangentially echoing Hamlet, he observes that "one should not wish for 'a longer flame' than that of 'the grand example,' Jesus," and that therefore to mourn her husband's untimely death would mean to "curse" him with the prolonged suffering that is the recompense of the aged. In the penultimate poem that Shawcross cites in full text ("To my dear Sister, Mrs. S / The Chamber"), the language of resurrection and rebirth are implicit in the darkness of the tomb: Mrs. Sandys in her widow's weeds has cut herself off temporarily from all that is life-affirming and vibrant in mourning the man she loves, but like "a fair taper hid / In a dark lanthorn" or "an eye shut in's lid," she is only temporarily "buried," and must ultimately leave her "artificial darksome den" and rejoin the living, so that the "better part of [her] nature" can once again light the lives of the living around her. Hammond's own grief–for his dead brother-in-law as well as for the sister whose sorrow has driven her into self-imposed "entombment"–is clearly part and parcel of his offer of comfort, which makes no pretence of altruism. Indeed, if Hammond can succeed in consoling Margaret, he will perhaps induce "fortune…at last, [to] see to recompense her pain" (152), and thereby reduce his own in her behalf. His *Occasional Poems*, first published in 1655 and reprinted by Sir Samuel Egerton Brydges in 1816, are well worth reading and so is the essay that brings them to light.

That is likewise true of Margo Swiss' entry on Milton's *Paradise Lost*, the last in the collection and the *locus terminus* of its focus. Viewing the epic from the perspective of seventeenth-century definitions of grief, Swiss argues that Eve's tears are represented not only as healthy but as restorative–it is her grief in "the first emotional weeping in history" (269), "a continuum of weeping that begins with [her] tears in book 5" and ends as she and Adam leave the Garden forever, that represents not only her "progressive individuation from Adam" (279), but an "agony in a postlapsarian Eden [that] is a feminine, human version of Christ's agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. As Christ will endure *Deus Absconditus*, during the process of his Crucifixion, she also experiences the excrutiating sense of her own abandonment by both God and husband" (280-281). Nonetheless, the "reconciliatory work that ensures between Adam and Eve in union with God's grace replicates the cooperative work of redemption itself," and their "liturgy of love … 'repairs' their fractured androgyny" (282).

Ralph Houlbrooke's comprehensive summary in the Afterword suggests a number of avenues of investigation that the essays in this collection have not explored , among them "the ways in which different religious beliefs or standpoints influenced the literary expression of grief" (300)–and particularly the influence of the Protestant Reformation on the articulation of "'rigorist' attitudes to grief" (301)–as well as "the relationship between the written word and the visual arts [and the expression of sorrow] in this period" (300). Even so, the collection is a valuable contribution to the study of human bereavement and should be a welcome addition to the libraries of literary scholars of the early modern era and historians alike.

S. K. Heninger, Jr. *The Cosmological Glass: Renaissance Diagrams of the Universe*. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library Press, 2005. 232 pp. + 154 illus. $21.95. Review by KATE GARTNER FROST, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

This large-folio, profusely illustrated, and beautifully designed work has always wanted to be a coffee table book. But its sheer excellence as a resource both for teaching and stimulating research has, in this reviewer's experience, put paid to that idea. Now, after a quarter century, *The Cosmographical Glass* has