

tional complications in instruments that represent much in little, “multum in parvo,” and consequently of texts such as epigrams and Chapman’s translation of *Achilles’ Shield*.

“Inhumanism: Spenser’s iron man” recapitulates and reconstitutes the promises and problems of mechanistic analogies during the era by focusing on fusions of the human and the mechanical in fantasies of war automata and machines. Talus, the instrument of justice in Book V of Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*, becomes from one perspective the ideal martialist and consummate stoic perfected beyond passion; from another the horrific dominion of the warrior, method, and instrument from which all humanity has been extracted. The animate has been replaced by the inanimate, the soul by iron.

In *Humanism, Machinery, and Renaissance Literature* Wolfe offers a panorama of Renaissance humanist culture at a productive nexus from an unusual perspective. Students will find a multitude of suggestive contexts within which to consider their own projects, ideas from which they can extrapolate topics, and models for investigating domain sharing and productively ambiguous analogies. Valuable too is Wolfe’s reminder of the treasure trove in language subtly investigated. Precisely because our understanding is embedded in language and analogy, our inquiries therein can reveal vistas and delve depths.

Adam Smyth. *“Profit and Delight”: Printed Miscellanies in England, 1640-1682*. Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 2004. xxii + 246 pp. \$39.95. Review by A.H. DE QUEHEN, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

“*Profit and Delight*” is based on a study of forty-one printed miscellanies published between 1640 and 1682, a carefully chosen group out of the very large number of verse (or verse-with-prose) collections that the seventeenth century produced. Adam Smyth is not directly concerned with manuscript miscellanies, or with printed volumes of political or university verse, or with commonplace or songbooks, all of which he mentions from time to time. His chosen books are of a certain compact size, “usually octavo or duodecimo publications of between 100 and 300 pages,” and their favourite verse forms are “the epigram, the comic epitaph, the ballad, the epistle, the lyric, the mock, and the dialogue. ... The material was altered to suit the envisioned purposes of readers; was often set in an educative, generally Royalist, frame; and was

offered as an emblem and exemplar of elite, usually courtly, life” (2). One of the attitudes that distinguishes these collections from later ones is the compilers’ apparently not caring who had written the poems. Smyth speculates that an Oxford student who copied from miscellanies into a notebook of his own “understood these poems to be his—that they had ceased to belong to the original author” (xxi). The miscellanies themselves suggest a controlling, dominant relationship between reader and text in the altered lines, substituted titles, and marginalia for which the compilers, and also the buyers and later owners of the volumes, were responsible. Certainly the changes made are very interesting: Smyth shows how Jonson’s “The Musical Strife; In a Pastoral Dialogue” was altered in part to fit the requirements of musical setting, but also to make a more conventional love-relationship between the two speakers or singers. “This kind of textual alteration—the flattening out of the idiosyncratic in pursuit of the generic—was characteristic of many printed miscellany editorial interventions” (82). Names of poems and melodies changed in the popular imagination: the tune “Greensleeves” came to be called “The Blacksmith” after being used for that popular song; Transcribers and compilers responded to public interest, and also anticipated it, when “quite deliberately reworking the materials they encountered” (76).

The Academy of Compliments (1640; 18th edn. 1795) set the social tone for wooers and other aspirants, most likely to be “gauche young men” of low rank (29). Smyth is unsure that miscellanies were *really* encouraging would-be courtiers: although they “apparently usher readers towards exclusive worlds, their real emphasis lies in the need for readers to appropriate elite wit within their own contexts”; so paradoxically they “discourage and therefore presumably limit social mobility” (71-72). But the gauche young prototypes of Dickens’s Mr. Guppy may have heeded the cautions as little as consumers generally do advertisers’ disclaimers: after all, court favourites *have* been spectacularly advanced from humble origins even in more stable times than the mid-seventeenth century. In any case, “*Stiles and Tearmes used to the KING, or QUEENES Majesty*” are essential for one’s royalist fantasies (23). In his chapter on “Politics, Themes, and Preoccupations” Smyth captures very well the mood of the Interregnum royalists, whose “defiance in the face of melancholy” found expression in the miscellanies’ humour (153). The interest in anagrams and codes—“Cardinal *Richlieus* Key, his manner of writing of Letters”—could be a practical one in those times; indeed, the harsh fate of true

lovers might have “political resonance” (142, 144). Poems or songs about marginalized groups, such as “The Blacksmith,” came to stand for royalists. Yet after 1660 the Cavalier “grievance at exclusion” persisted, with the “new courtiers” becoming the “catalyst for the true Royalist’s dislocation” (148). These Restoration miscellanies do, however, “show a quite dramatic reassessment of the merits of past and present” and “little concern with connecting with a better bygone age” (169). Smyth’s discussion of the books’ implicit politics enlarges one’s understanding of the explicitly political collections, which he does not discuss (and for which see, among other sources, the Rump website maintained by Mark McDayter at ett.arts.uwo.ca/rump/index.html).

Smyth discusses, although quite briefly, the relationship between printed texts and manuscripts. Like other scholars, he encounters the seventeenth century’s inexplicable love of copying and recopying: Why should John Boydell “bother spending such effort transferring poems to manuscript” out of miscellanies he probably owned (125)? To make them more completely his own? The motives of the printed miscellanies’ compilers are thus more easily understood, both their “textual carpentry” and their often subversive additions (87). A poem “On the Tombs of Westminster Abbey” is a hilarious example of the latter, as the guide’s patter, in ballad quatrains, is disrupted by his group’s prose comments in the margin (65-67). Smyth certainly understands transmissional situations, for example, “the evident *difficulty* of accurate transcription” when Pepys was trying to copy down a song during a performance (114). But it is possible to enter too far into the spirit of the occasion: thirteen errors in the six lines quoted from Pepys’s *Diary* (an omitted clause, ‘blackhead’ for ‘blacklead’, the other mistakes less significant). Although Smyth has plenty of notes (twenty-four pages), a few more things could be explained: Isn’t “the popular expression ‘to dine with Duke Humphrey’” in dictionaries of proverbs (48)? Who is Mosely—even if Rochester’s readers won’t have forgotten her after “Timon” (50)? But the interest and sheer pleasure of this book is unaffected by such dull complaints. As one titlepage announces, the miscellanies are “full of Mirth and Pleasure” (21), and Adam Smyth has read them as they should be read. Moreover, he has read them with informed mirth: “A lack of seriousness was not an apolitical stance. In particular, the kind of pleasure these texts suggest—a pleasure full of drink, mirth, ribald humor, disengagement—was in some ways a powerful attack on Commonwealth and particularly Puritan ideology” (21). His website

(www.adamsmyth.clara.net) provides an *Index of Poetry in Printed Miscellanies, 1640 to 1682*, where one can search the 4,639 titles. “Delight” scores fifty-two hits, “profit” four hits; but Smyth’s book is just as rewarding in each respect.

Katherine Gillespie. *Domesticity and Dissent in the Seventeenth Century: English Women’s Writing and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. xii + 272 pp. \$60.00. Review by JEROME S. DEES, KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY.

In this ambitious book, Katherine Gillespie has two broad aims. She seeks first to convince us that a small group of sectarian women writers “rightfully deserve to be included in ‘genealogies’ of liberal political theory” (13). But perhaps more controversially she wishes at the same time to rescue early modern political thought itself from the contention of “postmodern academic feminists” that liberal theory deriving from Locke’s *Two Treatises of Government* and its precursors is in fact a “blighted masculinist system” grounded in and perpetuating the continued subjection of women. Here she sets herself against such feminist scholars as Carole Pateman (whose *The Sexual Contract: Aspects of Patriarchal Liberalism* [1987] she finds seminal), Zillah Eisenstein, Catherine MacKinnon, Seyla Benhabib, and others. For these historians of political thought, a woman’s desire for “civil equality”—to be recognized as an individual—can never be fulfilled since, in Pateman’s words, “the ‘individual’ is a patriarchal category” (27). This is an error that Gillespie hopes to rectify through her elucidation of “an alternative source of political ideas” (25). To this end, her main claim is that the writings of Katherine Chidley, Anna Trapnel, Elizabeth Poole, Sarah Wight, Anne Wentworth, and Mary Cary “emerge rewardingly as a modest but nonetheless important body of heteronomous, multigeneric, performative, aspirational, allusive, religiomythological, exclamatory, and antinomian liberalism that intentionally critiqued its political world” (14). Gillespie’s argument cuts across three otherwise distinct disciplines: history, political philosophy, and literary criticism; and as this quotation suggests, her argument rests on a significant prior assumption: that effective political thinking may be accomplished outside the formal constraints of a systematically argued treatise. She argues her case strenuously and with a great deal of scholarly tact. While I am sympathetic to her aims and premises, the weighti-