

royal tree and be predicting his downfall: 'The key point here, finally, is that whether lamenting the fall of the Stuarts, attacking William III, or doing both simultaneously, Dryden's lines embody a cynicism and uncertainty that are distinctly unheroic' (p. 134). Yet the translation, which she admits has 'the vigour of many of his finest pieces', will scarcely strike an apolitical reader as uncertain, cynical, or unheroic in its effect. Like the best of Dryden it represents a judicious blend of the literal and the figurative: there is a vivid and realistic impression of a falling tree on the literal plane while through elegant personification the kingly tree is ennobled so that its fall, like that of the city to which it is so decorously compared, is rendered devastating and poignant. The rhythm and diction sustain the heroic note. This is the key point, and it has little, if anything, to do with politics.

All readers of Dryden's *Aeneis* will recognize in it touches of satire and wit absent from the original, but Caldwell in pursuit of her thesis overstates their effect; there is frequently a disparity between her comment and the tone of the lines quoted for illustration, as in the above example. Dryden's allusion to Salmoneus in *Absalom and Achitophel* and *The Medal* may well serve a satirical purpose, but his energetic translation of the passage, in which she says Dryden is seen to 'brandish once more his satirical sword' (p. 216), is no more satirical in tone and effect than the original in which Virgil pours scorn upon the vanity of the Titan's attempts to steal Jove's thunder. She recalls Hammond's citation of Dryden's version of the description of the Cyclops given by Achaemenides to illustrate the way in which epic seriousness gave way in the 1690s and after to "'carnivalised" representations of the classical world in burlesque even pornographic mutations' (p. 209). Yet, though it is certainly gruesome, there is nothing approaching the burlesque here; the translation simply brings out the grotesque horror that is a feature of this episode in Virgil as it is of the Cacus episode in Book VIII. In fact, it is too readily assumed throughout that Virgil represents an unquestionably decorous heroic norm from which Dryden frequently deviates. It is worth while reflecting that some of the arguments about the insecurity of the form made in relation to Dryden can be paralleled by similar arguments about Virgil's 'translation' or revision of the heroic norm represented by Homer. Regrettably, the effect of this enterprising study is somewhat marred by exaggeration and a lack of critical tact.

ROBIN SOWERBY *University of Stirling*

WILLIAM J. BURLING. **Summer Theatre in London, 1661–1820, and the Rise of the Haymarket Theatre.** Pp. 326. Madison, Teaneck: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press; London: Associated University Presses, 2000. £38.

Announced as 'the first full-length study of both summer theatre in London as well as the Little Haymarket Theatre', this volume is intended to fill a gap in theatre historical coverage of activity in the London theatre world from the Restoration to the early nineteenth century. Having found his niche, the author sets about exploring it with obvious delight and enthusiasm. For those interested in the minutiae of mainly Georgian theatre history, there is a wealth of information in this volume. However, the way it is structured at times makes it difficult to find information or to make cross-references.

In an appendix, the author gives a factual calendar of plays performed at the Little Theatre in the Haymarket between 1801 and 1820. Throughout the rest of the volume, he has chosen to surround purely factual information with a large amount of narrative

text. This seems to me an error. Not only does it make it difficult to find the factual information one wants, it also tempts the author into making extended narrative comments where few are needed. In particular, the first three chapters, which outline the chequered history of summer theatre activity prior to the work of Samuel Foote, make for very heavy reading. These three chapters take up approximately half of the written text in the volume, but only a few key issues are noted. These may be briefly summarized. Summer theatre using young actors was a notion first launched on a regular basis by Christopher Rich at Drury Lane in 1694 as yet another way of earning something for nothing. (Rich must rank as one of the most inventive exploiters of players on the London stage.) In the early decades of the eighteenth century, these groups of young players discovered by trial and error that a mix of light comedy and music theatre best suited the taste of the town in the summer months. By the 1730s, Henry Fielding was helping to ensure that the growing popularity of political satire was reflected in the summer repertoire, until the Licensing Act of 1737 brought all regular summer activity to a halt. These conclusions might easily have been arrived at in far shorter chapters, using a combination of factual tables and analytic text. As it is, they are buried within chapters that lack shape and focus.

There are other weaknesses of presentation in these early chapters. For instance, the author has problems with nomenclature. The Little Theatre in the Haymarket is variously referred to as the Little Haymarket, the Little Haymarket Theatre, and (on the title-page) the Haymarket Theatre. Consistency would have helped. On the other hand, when the author does opt for consistency in the case of the Marylebone Gardens, he opts to call them Marybone Gardens. This seems a strange choice, given the fact that even in today's London the area in question is still called Marylebone. By far the most serious error of presentation in the early chapters is a mistake in the note numbering sequence in Chapter 1: endnote cues 24, 25, and 26 are repeated in the text, wrecking the correlation between text cues and the actual endnotes for the remainder of the chapter.

In the second half of the volume, the author has a topic of more substance to address, and consequently needs less padding. His account of Foote's work in London, and in particular at the Little Theatre in the Haymarket, offers a number of fresh insights. Often dismissed as a fly-by-night or lambasted for his mimicry, Foote emerges from this account as an astute and sympathetic manager. His kindness to his permanent core troupe ensured their loyalty, and his repertoire policy greatly pleased the town. Not only did he write new farces on a regular basis for his theatre, he also commissioned new work from others at a time when the main patent houses were generally unwilling to do so. When George Colman the Elder took over the theatre in 1776 he too combined generosity and humanity in his treatment of his players with an astutely chosen repertoire. The author shows convincingly how Colman extended the range and amount of new and revived work presented by the Little Theatre in the Haymarket during his period of tenure. The only significant point of detail he fails to note is that, in the patent granted to him in 1766, Foote was expressly forbidden to sell or lease his patent to another. The fact that he was able to lease it to Colman in 1776 suggests a distinct softening of attitudes on the part of the authorities. The chapters dealing with the Colmans (father and son) are marred by yet another problem of nomenclature: Colman the Elder and Colman the Younger are often referred to as Colman Sr. and Colman Jr.: this labelling, linguistically and historically incorrect, simply jars.

More positively, these final chapters of the book present fresh insights into the financial problems faced by Colman the Younger when he took over the theatre from his father. It seems that his father's banker had defrauded Colman the Elder for years.

This meant that Colman the Younger, from the very outset, had to mortgage his interest in the Little Theatre to cover his father's unexpected debts. By 1805 his own profligacy and policy errors obliged him to take on management partners to enable the theatre to survive at all. The record of these final years, as presented in this volume, is a tale of management strife and discord (with Colman confined to virtual house arrest because of his debts). Set against this the author shows us the continuing vigour of Colman's repertoire and personnel policy.

Much of the evidence presented in this volume is new, and the author is able to offer a number of original conclusions. In particular, the account of Colman's final years as a manager is an extraordinary tale, and many of the details have not been so fully explored in any previous study. Despite *longueurs* in the early chapters, and problems of nomenclature and endnote citation, this is a painstaking study of a neglected facet of London theatre history.

DAVID THOMAS *School of Theatre Studies, University of Warwick*

The Poems of Jane Barker: The Magdalen Manuscript. Edited by KATHRYN R. KING. Pp. 74 (Magdalen College Occasional Paper 3). Oxford: Magdalen College, 1998. £7.95.

Jane Barker had a most unusual education for a seventeenth-century gentlewoman: aided by her brother, she studied not only Latin and classical poetry but herbal medicine, anatomy, and physiology as well. She practised as a healer, a vocation celebrated in the poem 'On the Apothecarys filing my bills amongst the Doctors'. Later, she followed James II and his court to St Germain, returning to London late in life. She is best known for the partly autobiographical fiction she wrote in her sixties and seventies, which interests students of the emerging novel for its unconventional heroine and its rejection of the love plot. These novels (now available in Carol Shiner Wilson's recent edition under the name of *The Galesia Trilogy*) contain versions of some of the poems Barker had written many years earlier. In the context of the fiction, these illustrate Galesia's twin devotion to the practices of writing and medicine, and her related embrace of 'A Virgin Life', celebrated in one of the poems. Barker's poetic *œuvre* ranged more widely than this: the youthful struggles with her vocation, expressed in correspondence with a coterie of Cambridge students, gave way to the religious anxieties of a Protestant converting to Catholicism and the bitter political polemics of a Jacobite exile in St Germain. Fifty-three early poems were published, apparently without her consent, as *Poetical Recreations* in 1688, while a later manuscript collection of twenty poems, now in the British Library, was presented to the young Prince of Wales (the Old Pretender) in 1700. The largest and most significant text of her poetry is the 272-page manuscript volume 'Poems on several occasions', now in Magdalen College, Oxford, and thoroughly described and discussed for the first time in Kathryn King's scholarly selected edition, published by the college as one of its Occasional Papers.

King does an excellent job of explaining the three-part manuscript and its significance, showing how Part One, 'Poems Referring to the times' (the same poems as the BL MS) interweaves the story of the Stuarts and their followers after 1685 with the Roman Catholic conversion of the poet's persona, Fidelia, while Part Two collects occasional verses emerging from Barker's life among the exiled Jacobites in the 1690s. The poems in Part Three, selected from those published in *Poetical Recreations*, were altered in this manuscript by Barker. King resolves manuscript problems, showing that