

size specified by Cistercian legislation. Helen Zakin examines the stained glass windows from the Cistercian abbey of Mariawald, south-west of Cologne. Now housed in the Cleveland Museum of Art, these windows provide a narrative scene for the pilgrims who would have visited the abbey. Christine Kratzke then examines the place of Mary in Cistercian art, using some interesting and little-known objects from Dargun abbey in Mecklenburgh-West Pomerania as case studies.

Moving away from the Cistercians, Danielle V. Johnson, with the assistance of Lore Holmes, studies American collections of stone from Saint-Remi in Rheims, while Donna L. Sadler discusses the multiple meanings that the reverse façade at Reims cathedral would have carried for French royalty. Back to the Cistercians, James D'Emilio studies the Cistercians and Galician churches, before Chrysogonus Waddell then discusses the physical layout of the Paraclete, a layout which is not dissimilar to that of Cistercian precincts. Virginia Jansen points out some Cistercian elements in Canterbury and Salisbury cathedrals, and Carolyn Marine Malone does likewise for Wells cathedral. Lisa Reilly suggests new ways of examining Norman architecture, reminding us that the Normans took active steps to link themselves with earlier traditions. Jason Wood then investigates a late-medieval house at Furness abbey, built for a monastic official. Terry N. Kinder completes the collection with her account of an early nineteenth-century plan for a garden at the newly privatised Pontigny abbey, and her suggestion as to who may have commissioned the said garden.

*Elizabeth Freeman*  
*School of History and Classics*  
*University of Tasmania*

**Kozuka, Takashi** and **J. R. Mulryne**, eds, *Shakespeare, Marlowe, Jonson: New Directions in Biography*, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2006; hardback; pp. 332; R.R.P. £55.00; ISBN 0754654427.

At any time, this would have been a very good book indeed, but its appearance is particularly appropriate at this juncture, as the past few decades have seen both an obsession with the notion of 'the Death of the Author' and a strong increase of interest in biographical writing. It is not as though one can say that the latter is necessarily a straightforward academic reversal of the former. As Alan H. Nelson points out: 'We live in a time of renewed biographical interest in Shakespeare, if not among English department faculties, then certainly in the public at large' (p. 55). While perhaps academia might have changed course on its own steam, it

is conceivable that the outside world has provided at the very least some much-needed help. And the much saner, less theory-driven intellectual climate that now in general is coming to pervade 'English' departments owes much to the fact that ideas which should never have been adopted within the ivory tower have come to look increasingly absurd in the light of what has been happening outside it, for better or worse.

It is a sobering thought that Roland Barthes's piece 'La mort de l'auteur' was first published as early as 1968, that the English-speaking academic world was slow to undergo its influence, and then made it a fashionable notion until only quite recently. Anyone who needs to be persuaded that Barthes's views on the matter of authorship are unsound will find it helpful and illuminating to read Chapter 3, by John Carey, which raises the question: 'Is the Author Dead?' (p. 43). In contrast to many scholars who had never read W.K. Wimsatt's and Monroe Beardsley's 'The Intentional Fallacy', first published in 1946, Carey realises that much of what Barthes had to say had already been forestalled in this essay, which questioned the extent to which it is useful or valid for a literary critic, when interpreting a text, to call on knowledge of, or speculate about, the mind (or experience) of the author 'outside' the literary work he or she produced. As Carey makes plain, Wimsatt and Beardsley, though in some ways seriously at fault, are nevertheless a great deal more responsible and sensible than Barthes. In fact, I still find Wimsatt and Beardsley sufficiently impressive to be able to feel that perhaps the current zeal for biography runs the risk of encouraging the view (even if unintentionally) that somehow if only we knew much more about Shakespeare as a person we would inevitably 'understand' him better. Personally I think that of all authors Shakespeare is so naturally evasive in the way he writes that we might well see too much of the author in his work if we knew more about his life ('Ah, now we know that Shakespeare was a Catholic, so we'll read his texts as embodying a particular theological view', etc.)

I add immediately that this book is the product of superb, sober, and questioning scholarship, and that it is not guilty of ever turning any literary work into something simpler than it is. On the contrary, the authors are very aware of the complexity of the interrelationship between authors and their literary texts, and are always highly cautious in coming to any conclusions about biographical matters *per se*. I think we can all agree that, whatever the exact nature of the relationship between authors and their works, it may be at least potentially important, and that it is certainly of interest to know as much as we can about people who, however little or much of themselves they put into their creative writings, must have had

remarkable minds.

The essays derive, in some cases indirectly, from a conference of Warwick University's Centre for the Study of the Renaissance held in 2001, J. R. Mulryne tells us, who proceeds to write an introduction which is a model of its kind for lucid sense, grasp of its subject, and fullness of information, entitled 'Where We are Now: New Directions and Biographical Methods'. Both Mulryne and the other contributors range well beyond fashionable current biographies of Shakespeare such as that by Park Honan (1998), and that by Stephen Greenblatt (2004). Indeed, biographical work that pays close attention to the essays in this volume will turn into something very different – far more scholarly and less imaginative – than such rather self-indulgent accounts. Alan H. Nelson's recommendations (p. 65) would certainly be worth paying close attention to. In general, this book makes us acutely aware how very little we truly do know about Shakespeare's life, and how necessary it is for us to return to scholarly fundamentals.

Although new material is offered, much of the work, notably on Shakespeare, is concerned with showing – inevitably so, after what has happened – how biography should *not* be written. And in fairness to scholars of the last twenty years or so, it must be said that they have no monopoly on all-too-ready-assumptions or downright errors. For example, Nelson not only effectively produces scholarly evidence to demolish the contention that Shakespeare did not write the works commonly thought to be his, but also reminds us that the bizarre movement called 'anti-Stratfordianism' is one that precedes recent studies. Not all nonsense or inaccuracy in work on Shakespeare is necessarily based on the musings of French theorists.

The essay that to my mind is perhaps the most truly novel, even though using entirely traditional scholarly procedures, is the one that has pride of place, Blair Worden's 'Shakespeare in Life and Art: Biography and *Richard II*'. Hitherto it has been commonly believed (and I am one of many to have done so), that the play performed at the Globe on 7 February 1601, the eve of the earl of Essex's rising, was Shakespeare's *Richard II*. Given the subject matter of that play and the context of the performance, I think our confident assumption has been to an extent pardonable, even if rash. I feel fully convinced, however, that Worden is right in arguing that the play was *not* by Shakespeare and *not* Richard II, but another one. I am deliberately not going to give the secret away, for I hope that anyone interested in English Renaissance drama will read this exciting paper, even if nothing else in the book, though every essay in it is of high quality.

It was an excellent idea to include essays also on Marlowe and Jonson. For one thing, the papers on those authors show consistently that we know more about both of them than about Shakespeare, and also that, in different ways, their personalities are more strongly present in their dramatic works. The essays are just as good as those on Shakespeare. At the risk of being unfair to the other outstanding contributors, I should particularly like to single out the papers by Lisa Hopkins (on Marlowe) and Ian Donaldson (on Jonson).

This is so rich a book, with so many matters that should be discussed by a reviewer, that I genuinely regret not being able to say more than I have. However, the best way to rectify this shortcoming is to recommend the book enthusiastically and unreservedly, and to express the hope that it will be widely read and bought.

Joost Daalder  
School of Humanities  
Flinders University

**Manion**, Margaret M., *The Felton Illuminated Manuscripts in the National Gallery of Victoria*, Macmillan Art Publishing, Melbourne, 2005: paper; pp. 440; 70 colour plates, 1 photograph; R.R.P. AUS\$99.00; ISBN 1876832959.

From the Zodiac sign on the front cover (in Theophanes' Gospel book) to *Leo* (the Lion) on the back cover (in the Aspremont Hours), this survey of the five illuminated manuscripts, obtained through the very generous endowment by Alfred Felton, combines excellent artistic reproductions with a very scholarly analysis of each work by Margaret M. Manion. The manuscripts range in time from the early 12th century to 1496, and in location from Constantinople in the East to Paris, Florence and Naples in the West, four great centres of art and learning. As the Forward points out, supported by Manion, apart from her own edition of the Wharnclyffe Hours, published by Thames and Hudson in 1981, not one of these masterpieces has been studied in full, despite past displays and catalogues that have revealed their treasures.

In her useful introduction (pp 13-21), Manion gives a brief account of Felton's bequest, and of Frank Rinder's admirable skill in finding manuscripts and paintings for Victoria's Library, Gallery and Museum. But she fails to point out this unique combination, which helped in the acquisition of such a large number of illuminated manuscripts, rather than just paintings and sculptures. This was mainly due to the