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Counter-Reformation theology likewise informs Russell Ganim’s study of Jean de La Ceppède’s annotations upon the 515 meditative sonnets of his *Théorèmes*. In this case, an emphasis upon the humanity of Jesus reinforces the poet’s submission to canonical teaching. Shifting to secular humanism, Gilles Bertheau’s essay on George Chapman demonstrates how the writer’s appeals to educated readers counter the misinterpretations of his work by hostile critics.

Four concluding essays address late seventeenth-century texts, showing how the dynamics of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century self-commentary played out in a later period. Joseph Harris examines Pierre Corneille’s prefaces to his collected plays in 1660 as attempts to address divergent responses of audiences, critics, and contemporary readers. Els Stronks applies Pierre Bourdieu’s model of a “literary field” to works by young Dutch authors who aimed to establish a formative national literature in their Republic. Magdalena Ożarzka speculates upon Anna Stanisławska’s prose glosses in her versified autobiography (1685) as efforts to empower it with authority. Carlo Caruso offers a study of artistry in the erudite but parodic self-commentaries by Alessandro Tassoni for his mock-heroic poem *La secchia rapita* (1630) and by Francesco Redi for his dithyrambic *Bacco in Toscana* (1685). In a thoughtful Afterword, Richard Maber iterates the great variety of forms and transformations, combinations and overlaps that characterize these commentaries. The fertile insights and extensive bibliographies that mark every contribution to the volume make it required reading for historians of Renaissance and Reformation literature.

William J. Kennedy
Cornell University

Warren, Nancy Bradley.
*Chaucer and Religious Controversies in the Medieval and Early Modern Eras.*

In her new book, Nancy Bradley Warren shows how Chaucer, as an author and an idea, has been used to define a range of early modern religious and political oppositions: Catholic and Protestant, medieval and modern, Latinity and vernacularity, Old World and New World, feminine and masculine, heterodoxy and orthodoxy. The strongest chapters in the book uncover, through careful
textual analysis and particularly deft use of historical and critical scholarship, new connections in the early modern reception of Chaucer and such Chaucerians as Lydgate, Hoccleve, and Bokenham. Chapter 2, “Chaucer, the Chaucerian Tradition and Female Monastic Readers,” for example, makes good use of work by David Bell, Rebecca Krug, Mary C. Erler, and others, to show that the nuns at Syon and Amesbury were just as interested in Chaucer’s secular writings, including *Parliament of Fowls* and *Troilus and Criseyde*, as they were in his religious writings, and that they drew from overtly political texts such as Lydgate’s *Siege of Thebes* and Hoccleve’s *Regiment of Princes* to engage with the political controversies of their day.

Chapter 3, “Competing Chaucers: The Development of Religious Traditions of Reception,” provides a welcome corrective to the familiar and somewhat tired story of Chaucer the proto-Protestant by showing how Tudor writers on both sides of the English Reformation used Chaucer as a powerful symbol of Englishness, legitimacy, and orthodoxy. In her reading of William Forrest’s *History of Grisild the Second*, in which Forrest associates Queen Mary with the folktale figure of patient Griselda, Warren argues that Chaucer’s *Clerk’s Tale* was likely Forrest’s main source. She thus demonstrates one way in which Chaucer served simultaneously to anchor an idea of a Catholic English past and to contain the dangers of Mary’s queenship by envisioning that past as “an age of ‘cloistered’ women who are chaste, passive, [and] silent on matters of religious controversy and political conflict” (79).

Chapter 4 analyzes Serenus Cressy’s use of Julian of Norwich and John Dryden’s use of Chaucer in their self-fashioning as English Catholics, and, in Dryden’s case, as poet-laureate. Warren tracks the gendered terms of the debate that unfolded between Edward Stillingfleet, bishop of Worcester, who attacked Julian’s *Revelations* as the idolatrous ravings of a hysteric, and Cressy, who defended Julian’s affective piety by comparing the intensity of her devotion to St. Paul’s. The chapter concludes on a powerful note, with Warren’s analysis of the 1713 frontispiece of Dryden’s *Fables*. Here she shows how the imagery of the frontispiece seems deliberately to blur the difference between female muse and male poet, an ambiguity that both refutes anti-Catholic rhetoric that sought to feminize Catholicism and maps onto the synthesis of “Mother Juliana” and “Father Chaucer” that Dryden sought to embody.

Warren is less persuasive in her readings of Chaucer’s female pilgrims and in demonstrating the relevance of Chaucer for understanding the religious and political aims of the colonial American writers Cotton Mather, Anne Bradstreet,
and Nathaniel Ward. Chapter 1 explores the “interplay” of female speech and spiritual power in the prologues and tales of the Second Nun and the Prioress, and points out possible echoes of the Briggittine tradition and Lollardy in both. The chapter as a whole relies on some rather strained connections, particularly with regard to the *Prioress’s Tale*, which Warren attempts to link to the Second Nun through the theme of vernacular speech. Because the little clergeon in the *Prioress’s Tale* does not understand the song he sings, precisely because it is in Latin, Warren contends that the tale is a kind of negative exemplum showing the need for nuns like the Prioress to have access to religious texts in English.

Warren’s case for seeing Chaucer as an “important” figure in Mather’s anti-Catholic writings rests on two passing references. In one, Mather quotes “Old Chaucer’s” words on *gentilesse* from *The Wife of Bath’s Tale*; in the second, he quotes the inscription on Chaucer’s tomb in Westminster in his verse epitaph for York pastor Shubael Dummer, who was killed, in Mather’s words, by “Popish Indians” (141–42). These references, though suggestive, do not warrant the claim that Chaucer’s works “figure significantly” in Mather’s “involvements in and negotiations of religious and political conflict in both Old and New England in the mid-seventeenth century” (12). The case for Anne Bradstreet is even more tenuous: Warren argues that the speech Bradstreet gives to a personified New England in her “A Dialogue between Old England and New, concerning their Present Troubles, anno. 1642” “resembles” the language used in Martin Marprelate’s anti-episcopal pamphlets, some of which feature a Langland-inspired plowman named Piers. It is hard to see how such a vague resemblance can support the claim that Bradstreet “engage[s]” with Chaucer and the Chaucerian tradition (12).

The relative weakness of chapters 1 and 5 stands out by contrast to the strength of chapters 2–4, which present fresh and finely nuanced readings of Chaucer’s early modern reception. This contrast is perhaps underscored by the book’s lack of a conclusion. (The book also lacks a bibliography.) At its best, *Chaucer and Religious Controversies* is stimulating reading for scholars and graduate students of Chaucer and the history of Christian thought, illuminating key ways in which the making of the English literary canon was inextricably tied to the making of early modern Protestantism in England.
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