non-dramatic poetry, a recurring thematic concern with authorship and publication, the book and the stage. And it provides him with much to say about literary form, for example about the relationship between printed lyric and staged song in the plays. But if one were to put a question to this admirable hook, it might he how Shakespeare could have (or why he would have) inscribed so clearly in his works the historical forces that Cheney describes acting on him in the first part of this hook. And what kind of inscription does Cheney regard this as? Do the plays and poems ‘exhibit’ (p. 201) a combination of poetry and theatre, or ‘argue’ for a more sustained interlock (p. 18) of the two modes? But these questions may very well he answered in the hook that is planned to follow this one, which will cover the plays in more depth. One unavoidable disadvantage of this two-volume project, as Cheney himself acknowledges, is that by concentrating first on the poems, he seems to be committing the same error for which he criticizes other editors and scholars: separating the dramatic and non-dramatic sides of Shakespeare's career, privileging one, and using one as a context within which to explain the other. With the two hooks side by side, they will he an even more impressive and valuable account of that career.

Christopher Burlinson
University of Cambridge
doi:10.1093/res/hgi088


Reviewing the first two volumes of The Shakespearean International Yearbook (AUMLA 102, November 2004), I observed that it has been a curious feature of our times that just as the bad work on Shakespeare seems to be extremely bad, the good work seems extremely good. Of late it has been my privilege to be asked to comment on what I consider to be truly good books more often than bad ones. The present volume provides ample justification for the belief that there are at present quite a few scholars producing truly excellent work on Shakespeare, and even more remarkable in the case of this collection of essays is the ability of the contributors to write with great skill and expertise not only on Shakespeare but also on the relationship between him and the classics, as well as on such worthwhile matters as how Shakespeare's classicism was received, adopted, or transformed by later writers. One of the book's most commendable features is that the authors do not see the issues they discuss merely as matters of source-hunting, but as vibrantly and endurably important in the growth of a creative literary culture.

The scope, coherence, and success of the book are such that the editors might have shown themselves confidently proud, but they are almost apologetic in speaking of it as 'lacking the individually focused vision that a single author could have brought to the task' (p. 3). One wonders whether any single person could truly have been well enough equipped to write about Shakespeare in relation to so many classical authors (not to mention post-Shakespearian ones). In the event, I feel that the editorial planning behind this volume has been quite extraordinary. I can think of few collections of essays on Shakespeare that are as intelligently conceived, and with such a clear and interesting sense of purpose, as this one; to me the book actually does seem to have a focused vision. Moreover, the idea of 'pairing' quite different authors—on, for example, Seneca—works very well in creating constructive diversity (a potential advantage which the editors themselves also mention).

I turn to the final two essays first in order to give some indication of the significance and value of what is offered. Both appear (appropriately) under the heading 'The Reception
of Shakespeare's Classicism', yet they are very different. The first essay, by David Hopkins, was to me personally the most important in the book because it led me to discard a jaundiced view of English 'neoclassicism' and its supposed attitude to Shakespeare. I must confess that I had ignorantly shared the widely held belief that this attitude 'seriously inhibited appreciation of Shakespeare's distinctive genius' (p. 261). Hopkins sets out to show that, on the contrary, the neoclassicists were well aware of Shakespeare's 'distinctive artistic stature'. He continues: 'During the period, I shall suggest, Boileau's translation of Longinus's treatise On the Sublime (1674) was a powerfully influential force in shaping a conception of Shakespeare as an inspired, original, and "fiery" poet of the Sublime, an "English Homer"' (p. 262). Hopkins makes his case excitingly and compellingly in a totally engaging essay. The implications are profound: the neoclassicists are not, in fact, wanting in their appreciation of Shakespeare, and we shall need to revise our judgement of them and the dichotomy which we have tended to see between their attitude and that of the Romantics. In addition, we no longer need to ask ourselves how it was that authors who admired, for example, Homer were seemingly incapable of admiring Shakespeare: they weren't.

Sarah Anne Brown's essay, which concludes the volume, is more directly concerned with imaginative interconnections of various kinds between classical writers, Shakespeare, later creative writers, and readers. Hers is a subtle and complex essay, full of surprising and illuminating insights, and attempting—successfully in my view—to identify and analyse a range of processes and procedures at work in later texts where Shakespeare and the classics are both present; her main contention is that 'the relationship between Shakespeare and the classics is still evolving, that it has been created rather than simply discovered by later writers' (p. 278). This essay is, one might say, more 'modern' in approach than Hopkins's, but none the worse or better for that. The two wonderfully complement each other.

Both essays show the enduring power of the creative literary imagination on the part of classical authors, Shakespeare, later writers, and readers, including of course readers who were or are also themselves creative writers as well as those (the majority) who have 'merely' responded creatively: our insight into the question as to how Western—especially classical and Anglo-Saxon—literary culture has developed and still is developing is immensely enhanced by this wide-ranging volume.

Appropriately, the book starts with an informative introductory essay on Shakespeare and humanistic culture by Colin Burrow, providing an impressive 'initial perspective'. This is followed by sections on Shakespeare's 'Small Latine' (as Ben Jonson wrongly called it) and his 'Lesser Greek', leading towards the final two essays I have already discussed. In the 'Small Latine' section Ovid rightly takes pride of place. No other Roman author, it seems, had a mind and creative view of the world quite as congenial to Shakespeare's own as this particular genius—at once so lateral in its perception and almost hyper-imaginative in action. We were already lucky to have been given, in recent times, such distinguished work as is found in Jonathan Bate's Shakespeare and Ovid (1993) and in Shakespeare's Ovid. The Metamorphoses in the Plays and Poems (2000) edited by A. B. Taylor, but the essays here, including one by Taylor himself, are totally deserving of their prominent place in this volume, and all of them have important new knowledge and insights to offer in their very different ways.

Taylor's fellow editor Charles Martindale has a less gratifying task than the 'Ovidians' in writing about Shakespeare and Virgil, but, given Virgil's status, we do need a chapter on this topic, and as someone who as a schoolboy was made to read large portions of this to my mind formidable but very unattractive author I was happy to see Martindale authoritatively confirm my general sense that 'Shakespeare is not usefully to be described as a Virgilian poet' (p. 89). Excellent chapters follow on Plautus and Seneca, both of them...
authors greatly important to Shakespeare. (I should add here that my own view of Seneca's impact on Shakespeare is not impartial, as in 1982 I discussed it at some length in my edition of Jasper Heywood's 1560 translation of Seneca's Thyestes).

The essays in the 'Lesse Greek' section are no less distinguished than those elsewhere, and perhaps even more noteworthy because the question of 'Shakespeare's Greek', both in the narrow sense ('did Shakespeare know Greek?') and in the wider one ('Just what was the extent and nature of the influence, on him, of Greek culture?'), has remained an extremely difficult one to answer. Fine and valuable essays on Plutarch are offered, but I found 'Action at a Distance: Shakespeare and the Greeks' (A. D. Nuttall), 'Shakespeare and Greek Romance: "Like an old tale still"' (Stuart Gillespie), and 'Shakespeare and Greek Tragedy: Strange Relationship (Michael Silk) yet more thought-provoking and instructive. There is not space to discuss them in detail here, especially since they are wide-ranging and complex. Silk, for example, packs quite a punch in a fascinating essay in which he shows himself acutely aware of the fact that, on the one hand, 'there is a real affinity between Greek and Shakespearean tragedy, while on the other, 'There is no reason to suppose that Shakespeare ever encountered any of the Greek tragedians, either in the original language or otherwise' (p. 241): he then fully explores the oddities and difficulties arising from these two observations in a way I cannot briefly summarize.

The editors, authors, and publisher deserve the greatest praise for producing this outstanding and stimulating book, which one hopes will reach a great many readers.

JOOST DAALDER
Flinders University
doi:10.1093/1res/hgi089


No scholar has made more contributions to the long overdue reassessment of Donne's preaching career than Jeanne Shami. Motivated by a justified righteous indignation at John Carey's eloquent but unsympathetic and ahistorical portrait of Donne as a monster of apostasy and ambition, Shami has produced a stream of articles which take Donne's apologetics for the Church of England and his calling to its ministry seriously, and which demand the consideration of his sermons as integral wholes that are genuinely engaged with their Jacobean and Caroline religious contexts. She has fully digested and understood the revolution in the historiography of the early Stuart religious culture epitomized in the works of Thomas Cogswell, Peter Lake, Kenneth Fincham, and (of most influence here) Anthony Milton. She has developed an unrivalled command of Donne's sermon bibliography, in both manuscript and print. Moreover, she has combined this bibliographical acumen with those historians' eye for the significance of sermons by lesser-known preachers to form an in-depth knowledge of the period's sermon culture. Some may feel, though, that little has been made of so much in this, her first monograph on Donne as a preacher.

The thesis of this study is simple (and, in this reviewer's opinion, correct): that Donne in his preaching developed, out of pastoral concern and an aversion to shrill confessional extremes (both 'puritan' and 'papist'), a religious profession of discreet moderation. Or, in Shami's words, Donne charted in the pulpit a 'programme of defusing controversy; redefining terms, and seeking consensus, without sacrificing distinctions he saw as crucial' (p. 235). The chronological focus of the book is defined by Shami's belief that these