

sometimes details are hard to locate in the black-and-white reproductions. Color pictures would help but would probably be too expensive. In addition, the footnotes appear on the same page as the reference, making them readily available for perusal. Overall, *Bodily Extremities* is an accessible book.

Michael Davies. *Graceful Reading: Theology and Narrative in the Works of John Bunyan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002. xv + 393 pp. \$85.00. Review by U. MILO KAUFMANN, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN.

Here is a careful, disciplined, well-argued effort to recover for the 21st-century reader an approach to Bunyan's writings, especially the allegories, which honors in fullest measure the author's stated intention in writing. With diligent attention to the scholarly commentary and debate of the last several decades, Davies insists upon a reading which in three ways is a corrective upon established approaches.

First, it is argued that the reader must allow Bunyan's theology of grace to push into the background any awareness of the determinism central to both Calvinist and Lutheran theologies. Bunyan's theology, we are assured, focuses upon covenanted grace which is an altogether adequate deliverance from the nightmare dead end of works. With grace in the foreground, and God's graciousness always the delight of lived Christian experience, the darker truths can be allowed to recede from attention, though not from one's creed.

Second, it is argued that Bunyan's only intent in writing was to impart saving and edifying truth, certainly not to entertain or divert. The reader is to be instructed by any number of strategies present in the text to practice a reading which turns away from carnal delights to an earnest and obedient Christian life. In this connection Davies takes issue with this reviewer and other critics

who have argued for something more by way of a belletristic approach to Bunyan, or at least for some apt acknowledgment of the imaginative elements in his major allegories.

Third, it is argued that biblical metaphor, particularly that of the typological kind, works, by virtue of its Puritan appropriation, more as discursive than as imaginative presentation. So, even though imagery is plainly involved, we are not to see any special concession to the imagination when Bunyan uses biblical figures, even if they are figures taken up with enthusiasm in the devotional tradition of heavenly-mindedness which stressed the potency of imagery in arousing feeling and so moving the will.

With his first argument I think no reader should have any dispute. Davies is a helpful guide for all those who have wanted legitimacy for their sense that Bunyan's world of faith is somehow congenial, however dark the fate of Ignorance or of other hypocrites unawares. Bunyan, we are told, wants us to be concerned about the perils of a religion of works, rather than with the inscrutable mysteries of election, about which no questioning is of any purpose. Grace is there for the person stirred to inquire after it.

Apropos of the second argument, I believe a qualified agreement is to be urged. Others have noted Bunyan's overriding didactic and spiritual concern, though no one, to my knowledge, has been so resolute in making it a principle by which to exclude other possible readings of the allegories. When I was a graduate student, the phrase "intentional fallacy" was much in fashion. I understood the term to mean, roughly, the mistake of expecting to find in a work everything the author said was there, or expecting not to find anything he said was not present. I recall a recent trip to Morocco and a discussion with a Muslim guide on the nature of the Koran. I expressed my appreciation for some of the splendid poetry of that sacred book. "No, no," my guide insisted. "There is no poetry in the Koran." I could not tarry long enough to work for some agreement upon definitions. It seems to me that two polar positions are possible on this matter of what a reader is free to find in a text. One holds strictly to the author's instruction, and the

other, with Robert Frost, is willing to give the author credit for everything found in the text, whatever the author's conscious intention.

I doubt that any youthful or untutored reader of *The Pilgrim's Progress* these days is much concerned with whether the Bible, or any allegory based upon it, is properly seen as containing poetry or spellbinding story. If that is how it is registered, the uninstructed response is legitimate. Northrop Frye once observed that romance is what people read without anyone telling them they have to. The romance, or mythic elements, in *The Pilgrim's Progress* will go on having their appeal, alongside the Christian message which, too, if for other reasons, continues to find its willing readers. It is the implied condemnation of the one kind of reader which I resist, whatever Bunyan's intent.

In connection with the third argument, a subtle one about biblical figures and the question of whether or not the imagination is encouraged, I point to a peculiar feature of Reformation thought. To my knowledge, none of the Reformers meets head-on the question of the mental imagery which is a natural response to most of the Bible's figurative language. I once was an outside reader for a doctoral thesis written at an Indian university which argued that, in effect, John Milton was a hypocrite and a heretic for not eschewing the mental imagery which he allowed for in response to his poems. It is certainly true that Reformed iconoclasm did not extend so far as to address boldly the question of mental imagery. (A strict reading of the second commandment would seem to discourage such efforts of the imagination.) Yet, if we define the imagination as, among other things, the faculty for producing images in response to sensation or text, then, whenever we have a disciplined evocation of images by a text, we have a right to speak of the encouragement of the imagination. It is just such an explicit reliance upon imagery which characterized the innovation in Puritan heavenly-mindedness and which, it can still be claimed, illuminates that broader and looser use of biblical imagery which many of us readers continue to respond to in Bunyan.

What, I think, is of greatest value in Davies's single-minded argument is his illumination of Bunyan's own single-mindedness. Bunyan, the powerful exhorter, winsome devotional writer, expert evangelist, is in sharp focus in this presentation. I would add, though, to use some of Bunyan's words which Davies cites, that in all these roles he relies upon apt imagery so that a reader might see "a whole heaven . . . intimated, where it is not at all expressed" (79).

Claude J. Summers and Ted-Larry Pebworth, eds. *Fault Lines and Controversies in the Study of Seventeenth-Century English Literature*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2002. ix + 236 pp. \$37.50. Review by CHRISTOPHER BAKER, ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY.

This book is the last in the series of published essays compiled from the biennial meetings of the Renaissance Conference at the University of Michigan-Dearborn. The indefatigable editors are to be congratulated for the quality of all twelve volumes which have made such strong contributions to the vitality of Renaissance, especially Jacobean, literary studies. The present essays are noteworthy for the ways in which they refract overlapping critical concerns. For this reason, Robert Evans's opening article is a fitting "manifesto" for the collection. "What is Truth?: Defining and Defending Theoretical Pluralism" is his irenic call for a greater tolerance of differing critical methodologies. It is also a vigorous, though not strident, rebuttal of Ellen Rooney's *Seductive Reasoning: Pluralism as the Problematic of Contemporary Literary Theory* (1989). She posits an audience holding irreconcilable views which criticism must undertake to persuade; Evans counters by theorizing that pluralism assumes as equally valid differing constructions of author and text, such that "any answers elicited can only be partial ones, not absolutely or completely final" (17). His proposal is lucidly attractive, not least for displaying a critical humility sometimes lacking among postmodern practitioners. His response to Rooney illustrates the thesis of Dennis Flynn's "Conjecture in the Writing of Donne's Biography, with a Modest Proposal." Flynn takes issue