to the varying demands made on them by their spouses, contrasting the 'compliant wife, Lady Puntarvolo, who ends up rejecting the pornographic role imposed … by her husband' with 'Fallace, the wilful wife who seizes the pornographic advantage, turns her gaze lustfully beyond her husband, and asserts her own erotic pleasure' (73). And in a detailed reading of the humiliation of the Lady Saviolina, Sogliardo, and Carlo Buffone in Act 5, she applies to Macilente's manipulation of the situation some striking insights derived from the works of Erving Goffman and other social theorists about the value of laughter as a bonding agent, the problems of loyalty to a group, and the distinction between insiders and outsiders. Her introduction thus makes a strong case for her claim that 'Jonson may have been the first "social psychologist" to make extensive use of the overtly dramaturgical standpoint both as an "analytical tool" and as a "determinant of action", in order to elucidate the complexity of human behaviour' (71). By showing in detail how Jonson's dramaturgy achieves these aims, Ostovich makes possible a new appreciation of *Every Man Out*'s satiric method.

W. David Kay

Anne Lancashire. *London Civic Theatre: City Drama and Pageantry from Roman Times to 1558.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. Pp xix, 355.

In the introduction to her book, Anne Lancashire notes that scholarly interest in early drama has been overwhelmingly focused on the provincial drama. This is understandable given the major problem of the lack of extant dramatic material associated with London, and the relative scarcity even of records, certainly before the mid-sixteenth century. Observing that London-based theatre did not suddenly spring up in the late 16th century, but that long before this there was a tradition of city sponsored dramatic activity, she sets out to examine civic theatre from London's founding by the Romans to the accession of Elizabeth I. Her approach is historical and speculative rather than theoretical and interpretative, attempting to piece together from available clues and informed guesswork the history of a tradition or range of traditions. Because the availability of records improves as the history of the city progresses, the earlier the period the more the deductive work that needs to be done. In the

case of Roman London, the lack of relevant archaeological remains (though it is very surprising that she makes no mention of the admittedly fairly recently discovered Guildhall amphitheatre) leads her to deduce the probability of theatrical activity from the fact of the city's importance and comparisons with other centres in the empire. In dealing with the early medieval period, a similar deductive approach is taken but the probabilities of the nature of dramatic activity in the city are here based on what is known of religious and secular theatrical practice elsewhere in the country. Some information on this early period is available from chroniclers – albeit very patchy – while from around 1200 more consistent civic and ecclesiastical records give some actual evidence of activity, mostly in the form of royal entries and civic pageants. In the light of the sorts of devices found in the more technically advanced contemporary early religious drama in the provinces, such as *The Castle of Perseverance* or the Digby *Mary Magdalen*, Lancashire reflects that these London pageants might also have had elaborate structures to enhance their visual display. She notes also the beginnings of the Midsummer Watch and the Clerkenwell/Skinners Well play in the late fourteenth century but points out that the presence of several major religious institutions in the capital may have obviated the need for a civic play on the lines of those found in several of the larger provincial centres, the Clerkenwell play evidently ending in the early fifteenth century. Lancashire suggests later indirect involvement of the civic authorities in plays was possible through the Merchant Taylors' Company, but that this sort of drama seems to have been replaced by private indoor plays in the fifteenth century, and that London was full of theatrical and theatre-like activities in this period. What activity there was is usefully documented as she combs the records of livery companies for evidence of their hall plays in the fifteenth century; identifying, however, not only the difficulties inherent in the interpretation of these, but that the variability in the availability of records might give a misleading impression of the levels and range of theatrical activity in different periods. The larger national picture is again brought to bear as she suggests that the whole range of plays identified from the fifteenth century could have been played in London and, while few are identifiably connected with the city, those that are include Medwall's *Nature* and some of Lydgate's mummings. The records of livery company performances do not suggest new commissions but rather that performers engaged by the companies probably had their established repertoires on offer.

In the later fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries extant records become more numerous and entries into the City include more ceremonial display. Lancashire looks with some detail at practice with regard to both land entries and

water shows in the period. References to shows on the water date back to the twelfth century, but a shift of mayoral processions to include activity on the Thames appears to have occurred in the mid-fifteenth century. She notes that by the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries royal water entertainments had also become generally popular, including mock battles.

The final two chapters are devoted to two major regular instances of civic display and performance that had their major development in the sixteenth century: the Midsummer Watch and the Lord Mayor's Show. The Watch, which no longer existed by the time Stow was writing in 1598, was sponsored jointly by the civic government and the livery companies. The potential reasons for the decline of this spectacle are examined in some depth, including the idea that it was possibly associated too much with Catholicism and the fact of the competition with the mayoral event; but Lancashire suggests that the reasons for the demise of the Watch were probably a combination of factors including Henry's interest in promoting musters instead for the sake of his wars, the desire of the civic authorities to privilege instead the Lord Mayor's Show, and the escalating costs of the event. She discusses at some length the relationship between the disappearance of the Watch and the rise of the Lord Mayor's pageants, including the idea that some pageants transferred from the former to the latter, though conceding that the records offer no certainty that this took place.

The volume concludes with two appendices. The first contains a list of all major royal and other entries into London from 1400 to 1588 including information where available on specific dates, entry types, general routes, whether or not they contained pageants and conduits running with wine, and the involvement of the mayor. This is admitted as incomplete and a 'work in progress'. The second appendix is a list of selected civic records, many of which have not been previously published, on the Midsummer Watch, entries of Henry V in 1413, of the Duke and Duchess of Bedford in 1426 and of Henry VI in 1429, in addition to sixteenth-century documents relating to John Heywood, Thomas Brandon, and the Mayor's oath taking ceremony.

Lancashire maintains a very rigorous approach to the meanings of the available evidence and weighs up diverse interpretations where they are or might be made. The way that she makes data on civic and public performance readily available is also a valuable feature of the volume, something that is perhaps most clearly evident in the appendices but which actually occurs throughout. This data is appropriately contextualized as far as it is possible to do so, enhancing its usefulness and underscoring the relevance of its information. Part of the real importance of the book is that, though it does not set out

to be a theoretical study, it does both provide in some senses a theoretical historical framework for any work that might be done on London pageant and drama in the future, and constitute a starting point – as informed as it can be at present – for an understanding of London's civic longer term dramatic traditions. It attempts to set out something of the continuing story of public performance in London up to the mid-sixteenth century, ingeniously filling in gaps in knowledge through informed speculation and comparison with analogous situations and practices elsewhere. It is a book that needed to be written.

Darryl Grantley

Courtney Lehmann. *Shakespeare Remains: Theater to Film, Early Modern to Postmodern*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2002. Pp xii, 267.

The wit, intelligence, and scholarship of this study are reflected in its title. *Remains* functions here as a verb, as well as the noun employed by Heminge and Condell to describe their late colleague's plays in the first folio. Lehmann argues that something of Shakespeare remains and endures despite the problematization of authorship wrought by late twentieth-century theory and despite the transformations wrought upon the playtexts not only in individual film adaptations but also by film as a framework for understanding art, culture, and entertainment. Demonstrating deep conversance with literary theory along with film theory, Lehmann challenges recent critiques of the idea of the Author in the Early Modern period; she anticipates, to some degree, some of Lukas Erne's arguments in *Shakespeare as Literary Dramatist* (2003). But then, Shakespeare himself, 'what is in the text, more than the text', anticipates and provokes later cultural developments and even cinematic techniques.

Chapter one considers Shakespeare as an 'Unauthor', uncharacteristically beholden to a single source for *Romeo and Juliet*. Placing the playwright amid shifting definitions of authorship and invention, Lehmann finds a parallel between Romeo's attempts to break free from the Petrarchan discourse that defines him and Shakespeare's attempts to 'Author' himself while demonstrably revising Arthur Brooke's poem *The Tragicall Historye of Romeus and Juliet*. The play's language shares in thematizing the problem through its constant