

points out, was given its title by editors, is missing its first eighteen pages, and refuses both linearity in its structure and a final ending. As Lynch shows, this fluid and palimpsestic work captures in its structure Baxter's view of the self as a work in progress; there is an intriguingly postmodern feel to his avoidance of decisive markers in his text as in his life: "Yet whether sincere Conversion began now, or before, or after, I was never able to this day to know" (269).

In summary, then, *Protestant Autobiography* is a meticulously researched, deeply learned study of an intriguing set of devotional narratives set against their particular historical contexts. It will be of great interest to historians and literary scholars alike in its attention to the mutual imbrication of historical event and personal narrative; since it explores in fascinating ways the intersection of self, narrative, and experience it also contributes to philosophically oriented inquiries about the nature of experience. Finally, the study attends in illuminating detail to the history of the book, providing this reader at least with a wealth of hitherto invisible information about the textual and publication history of a diverse selection of texts.

Gillian Wright. *Producing Women's Poetry, 1600-1730: Text and Paratext, Manuscript and Print*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. x + 274 pp. + 5 illus. \$99.00. Review by JULIE D. CAMPBELL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY.

In this useful study, Wright focuses on five English poets, Anne Southwell, Anne Bradstreet, Katherine Philips, Anne Finch, and Mary Monck, thus covering figures from the seventeenth to early eighteenth centuries. Dedicating a chapter to each of these women, Wright contextualizes their lives, discusses pertinent manuscript and print practices, and provides detailed close readings of their poetry.

Although she incorporates biographical and paratextual information into her analyses, Wright argues that the scholarship of the 1990s with its focus on canon expansion and modes of writing, as well as more recent scholarship emphasizing the material and paratextual aspects of women's writing, should be less intently pursued; she instead

pushes for more focus on “the traditional stuff of literary criticism” (10). She asserts that “after several decades of intensive primary research” scholars should now “take as much account of form, ideas, imagery and genre” as they do of materiality (10), hence her attention to close readings. Regarding her choice of poets, Wright notes that the one factor setting them apart from other women writers of this period is that “in each case, they, or others close to them, were responsible for compiling *collections* of their poetry” (10). She argues that this distinction is important because “it is testament to the seriousness with which their writing was regarded, either by themselves or by their family and friends” (10). Additionally, she points out that in these cases one may track the “processes of negotiation, exchange and appropriation between manuscript and print through which, in different ways, these women’s poetry was constructed, shaped and disseminated” (15).

After warning that biography can be a risky tool when applied to women’s writing, Wright notes that biographical factors can indeed “help both to reconstruct the literary and social contexts for Southwell’s writing and also to decode the complex textuality of her manuscripts” (18). She examines Southwell’s two surviving manuscripts, Folger 198 and Lansdowne 740, asserting that the former, a miscellany, “presents a complex picture of Southwell’s literary connections” (45), which she explores. Regarding the latter, the Decalogue poems, she delves into the debate over whether they were meant for presentation to James I or Charles I, pointing out that “there is little definitive evidence either way” (47).

Assessing the responses of “Americanists and feminists” to Bradstreet’s poems, Wright considers how both groups seem to find them “embarrassing” (57). She argues that “reading the textuality of *The Tenth Muse*—its paratexts, its internal organisation, its generic selectivity—is essential to appreciating what Bradstreet’s earlier readers, in both Old and New England, valued in her poetry...” (59-60). She especially discusses at length “The Four Monarchies,” providing interesting considerations of Bradstreet’s print sources and generic contemporaries, helping the modern reader better understand the verse history in its historical moment.

Wright argues that Philips was different from English women writers who came before her because her *Poems* (1667) “represented the most varied and ambitious single-volume female-authored publication yet produced, and elicited unprecedented acclaim from both male and female readers” (98). She examines the posthumously published *Poems* of 1667 along with the Tutin, Clarke, Dering, and Rosania manuscripts, and *Poems by Several Persons* (1663), exploring the textual relationships among them. She concludes that tracking Philips’ development from Tutin through the rest “enables us to see how ... she built on ... early achievements, developing her sense of poetic agency and responding creatively to the challenges variously offered by the Restoration, her year in Ireland, and the traumatic publication of *Poems* (1664)” (145).

For Finch, Wright especially takes on the subject of agency, noting that “Anne and Heneage Finch worked together so closely that in many areas of their lives it can sometimes be difficult to distinguish one spouse’s activities from the other’s” (157). She also notes the potential influence of the poetry of William Kingsmill, Finch’s father, commenting on the commonalities in their writing. She explores Finch’s reading evident in her poetry, her affinity for Tasso, for example, and provides close readings of material from three manuscript collections and the print collection, *Miscellany Poems* (1713). Throughout, she pursues the thread of Finch’s authorship vs. Heneage’s editorship.

Finally, Wright considers the case of *Marinda* (1716), a miscellany dedicated to Caroline of Ansbach, compiled by Robert Molesworth from the poetry of his deceased daughter, Mary Monck. Noting that Monck is probably the least known of the poets considered here, Wright asserts that Monck’s “skilled, idiosyncratic and allusive poetry deserves a wider readership and more detailed scholarly scrutiny than it has so far received” (194). Particularly interesting is her examination of the European connections of Robert Molesworth and his sons John and Richard. She especially considers how John’s diplomatic career in Italy and his affinity for Italian writers may have led to the “idiosyncratic array of Italian poets translated in *Marinda*” (201).

In her conclusion, Wright points out that early modern women’s poetry “does not represent a single, unbroken narrative of progress” (241), but that one can see the seventeenth and early eighteenth cen-

turies as “a time of expanding possibilities for English women poets” (242). To prove her point, she provides an insightful survey of ways to consider progress in English women’s writing, from that of Aemilia Lanyer to Aphra Behn.

In the end, Wright’s study underscores the value of the ground-laying work of scholars of the 1990s and early 2000s, which has clearly paved the way for her own scholarship. With this book, Wright provides readers of early modern English women’s poetry a valuable resource for textual and paratextual histories regarding these women’s *oeuvres* and models for further close readings of their poetry.

Judith H. Anderson and Jennifer C. Vaught, eds. *Shakespeare and Donne: Generic Hybrids and the Cultural Imaginary*. New York, New York: Fordham University Press, 2013. viii + 291 pp. \$55.00. Review by GRAHAM ROEBUCK, MCMASTER UNIVERSITY.

The editors have assembled nine challenging essays, varied in approach and focus, that consider possible literary relationships, including dialogue, between the poet-priest and the poet-playwright. If this is how we initially categorize Donne and Shakespeare, the editors prepare us to think about them differently. In the context of literary genres and the imagination of the age, as transgressors of generic boundaries they are “themselves generic hybrids” (Introduction, 2). There is little speculation about the possibility of direct interaction between the two contemporary denizens of London’s theatrical and literary worlds. Donne as “a great frequenter of Playes” is mentioned in passing. The implications of Sir Richard Baker’s brief notice of his “old acquaintance” and his progress from youthful pursuits to his becoming “so rare a preacher” are not pursued in this volume. Likewise, the debate raised by earlier scholars about Donne’s attitude to the theater exemplified by Patrick Crutwell’s confidence in Donne’s “deep and lively experience of the theatre” (*The Shakespearean Moment*, 1960) and Victor Harris’s claim that “Donne rejects the theatre” noting his “antipathy toward the theatre nearly every time he mentions it” (“John Donne and the Theatre,” *PQ*, 1962) is also not pursued. These are not the questions asked. Direct influence and borrowings are incidental