

of the printer's shop, he certainly achieved a good view from a window. McKenzie, who had spent several years editing the records of actual late seventeenth-century and early eighteenth-century printers, pointed out that things did not work in the smooth and systematic way Hinman had posited. As with Pollard and the 'bad' and 'good' quartos or Bowers and the 'veil of print', Hinman was drawing human or social conclusions which the very impressive physical evidence of his study did not, and could not, support. Although McKenzie would go on to refine our understandings of the changed nature of bibliographical studies in *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*, 'Printers of the Mind' is the essay which, in the truest sense, is seminal.

Section four on Selling has essays on the Frankfurt Fair by John L. Flood (321–62) the marketing of scholarly books by Ian Maclean (363–77) and a note on survival and loss rates from the Stationers' Stock by John Barnard (379–81). Section five, on Reading, begins with Paul Saenger's essay on the effects on reading of the printed page (385–449) which, aside from eliminating Gothic cursive script and encouraging the use of certain punctuation, had the remarkable effect of encouraging the use of foliation, page numbering, and other alpha-numeric location devices not only by printers but by authors because with printing all copies of a particular book looked alike and they had none of the internal distinctions to be found in manuscripts. This is followed by Lisa Jardine and Anthony Grafton's essay (451–99) on how Gabriel Harvey read his Livy in which they deal with the vastly complex and, at the same time, seemingly ordered way Harvey set about his Humanistic reading. The section, and the volume, concludes with David Cressy's essay (501–15) on the cultural significance of the book, particularly the Bible, in seventeenth-century England and particularly New England.

This volume is in every respect, save one, a solid and useful collection and addition to the growing literature on Book History. The one reservation is the price. At £150.00 on one side of the Atlantic and \$250.00 on the other this book will find its way into the hands of very few scholars and students and, in the current

economic distress of university library budgets, into probably a shockingly small number of university libraries. If Ashgate wishes to provide a real service to the study of Book History, they will have to find some way to bring down the price of this volume and the other volumes in this series.

WILLIAM PROCTOR WILLIAMS
University of Akron

doi:10.1093/notesj/gjr254

© The Author (2012). Published by Oxford University Press.

All rights reserved. For Permissions,
please email: journals.permissions@oup.com
Advance Access publication 12 January, 2012

ANNE E. B. COLDIRON, *English Printing, Verse Translation, and the Battle of the Sexes, 1476–1557*. Pp. xvi + 264. Farnham and Burlington: Ashgate, 2009. £55.00 (ISBN 978 0 7546 5608 1).

ENGLISH Printing, Verse Translation, and the Battle of the Sexes, 1476–1557, is a remarkable work of recovery. It revisits a little explored phenomenon in the first seventy-five years of English print culture—verse translation of French misogynist and misogynist texts associated with the late medieval *querelle des femmes*—and offers a comparative account of the mediations which these texts effected 'between cultures, between languages, between media, and indeed between the genders'(xii). From Caxton imprints through to the work of Tudor printer John Rastell, this book charts largely unmapped territory, bridging the period between the early fifteenth century and the English pamphlet wars on gender of the sixteenth and seventeenth century. In the process, it reveals a lively and popular culture of printed translations about women, men, marriage, sex, and economics that will have a significant impact on early modern studies.

Coldiron considers a heterogeneous mix of texts in her attempt to recover this unique stage in the history of Anglo-French cultural exchange. Chapters on Christine de Pizan's early English translations and reception, and John Heywood's first play, *A Mery Play* (1533), bookend three chapters on less well-known interventions in the battle of the

sexes. One of the great virtues of Coldiron's archival trawl is the provision of both primary transcriptions and interpretative gloss for a number of works that are otherwise inaccessible to many scholars. The rarest of these pieces—the 'Letter of Dydo to Eneas' from Pynson's *The Boke of Fame* (1526); *The Beaulte of Women* (1525); the paratexts from Wynkyn de Worde's *The Fyftene Joyes of Maryage* (1509); and Robert Copland's *malmarié* tracts: *A Complaynt of them that be to Soone Maryed* and *The Complaynte of them that ben to Late Maryed* (1535)—are available in appendices. For this reason alone the work is an invaluable resource for future research.

For those interested in the interface of manuscript and print in early modern England, Coldiron's discussion of Christine's afterlife is a very useful account of the ways in which print actively negotiated and reshaped manuscript sources and style. Instead of divorcing the two mediums, Coldiron reveals how scholarly emphases on Christine's manuscript presence in the bilingual Tudor court 'overlooks the large, new, English-only literary system developing after Caxton'(23), a system that could not count on an audience who were aware of the clerical and courtly context for her literary works on gender. Thus, while Pizan ends up not deauthorized but decontextualized in print, the literariness of the largely manuscript *querelle* 'may show up obliquely in the fact that so many of the early gender imprints are poems, not prose arguments'(23).

However, the real strength of the work lies in Coldiron's palimpsestic readings of the textual and paratextual evidence of the 'Englished' works. From translated contexts and form, to verse, to woodcuts, to colophons, her analysis offers plausible suggestions for the many textual inconsistencies she finds. Drawing on the work of Martha Driver, Coldiron's attention to the 'transformational arts' and 'aesthetic experiments'(xiii) of the print shop shows how the commercial and self-promotional aims of early English printers and translators actively reshaped the gender dialectics of the original texts. Often this had less to do with 'gendered acts' (22) than with the need to market the texts for a more diverse range of readers. Her discussion of Wynkyn de Worde's publication

of the anonymous *Interlocucyon*—a formal gender-debate poem that gives the woman the last word—shows how, despite very little change in content from French to English, De Worde's paratextual additions create a new, if inconsistent, literary frame for the text. The title uses woodcuts that represent 'everywoman' and a debating 'everyman', thus signalling to the reader that the work is a male-female debate. However, the irregularity in the appearance of speech banderoles above the male (missing) and female (left blank) figures could signal any number of conflicting messages to contemporary readers. While it may be just a broken woodcut, it could nevertheless hint at the silencing of women (some banderoles displayed speech), or it may visually suggest the woman's long last speech (a catalogue of bad men) that silences the man. Additional visual and verbal paratexts, including the well-known cleric at his desk and a framing 'Auctor' figure, appear to displace the everyman and everywoman of the debate back into the realm of clerical misogyny or courtly *chanson d'aventure*, oblique references to the French literary origins of the debate. The lack of coherence in these framing devices convincingly shows that poems on gender were 'a frequent site of experimentation' (81) for early printers and translators.

While most of the works studied by Coldiron transform French prose into English verse, the generic variety of the texts: proverbs, dialogue, poetry, drama, defy easy categorization and narrativization, and Coldiron is refreshingly undogmatic about imposing either. However, her brief chapter on Heywood's farce translation, *A Mery Play*, is less successful. No doubt this is symptomatic of its idiosyncrasy in relation to Heywood's oeuvre, but also likely because of generic considerations that required more comparative analysis (it is the only play discussed). Similarly, the lack of any concluding thoughts lends the monograph a perfunctory air. This is unfortunate because this is a sensitive consideration of the cultural capital of French gender dialectics in early modern England. It convincingly and imaginatively shows how 'Englished' works go beyond the scholastic and

courtly origins of the *querelle* and lead an active and demotic afterlife in English print culture. Highly recommended.

MELANIE BIGOLD

Cardiff University

doi:10.1093/notesj/gjr249

© The Author (2012). Published by Oxford University Press.

All rights reserved. For Permissions,
please email: journals.permissions@oup.com
Advance Access publication 12 January, 2012

SUZANNAH LIPSCOMB, *1536: The Year that Changed Henry VIII*. Pp. 240. Oxford: Lion Hudson, 2009.

SPEAKING to the Royal Historical Society in 1994, Steven Gunn compared the historiography of early Tudor politics to ‘trench warfare,’ noting that the ‘most spectacular impasse concerns the fall of Anne Boleyn.’¹ Following the late Geoffrey Elton, scholars have traditionally depicted Henry VIII as susceptible to domination by court faction. This was roughly the view of Eric Ives, whose biography of Anne remains a touchstone for historical scholarship. Retha Warnicke located the cause of Anne’s fall in her 1536 miscarriage: a deformed foetus triggered fears of witchcraft. Revisionist scholarship has instead depicted Henry as a strong king who believed in Anne’s guilt, and perhaps with good reason. These scholars further show Henry seeking the middle path between extremes in religious reform. G. W. Bernard was leading this charge in 1994, and he continues today, most notably in his 2005 book *The King’s Reformation*. His recent biography of Anne Boleyn argues that she might just have been guilty of adultery.

Suzannah Lipscomb’s *1536* charges boldly into the centre of these debates. Her book is probably more indebted to the revisionist scholarship of Bernard and Greg Walker than Elton and Ives. Like the revisionist Greg Walker, she sees Henry as a tyrant. Like Bernard, she depicts him as ‘deliberate and rational’ in religious affairs (127), a consistent seeker of moderate religious reform and the principal engine and guiding force of the

English Reformation. She even splits the middle of revisionist opinions at times, siding with Walker in assigning Anne’s fall to flirtation and indiscrete comments (80), rather than with Bernard on the likelihood of her guilt. Lipscomb more often hedges on the importance of court faction (as on pp. 191–2), a crucial issue in these debates. But she manages throughout to reconsider these events without seeming to be encumbered by intricacies of scholarly warfare.

She has indeed chosen a pivotal year. Anne Boleyn was executed in 1536, and the English Reformation was reconsolidated in this year by the relatively conservative doctrinal statement of the Ten Articles. It was the year of Katherine of Aragon’s death, which Henry was said to have publicly celebrated (a suggestion that Lipscomb refutes, claiming his colourful dress as mourning clothes). Holbein’s famous Whitehall mural, depicting a frontal pose of Henry with his codpiece on display, may have been painted in this year. A major rebellion broke out in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire that might have toppled a less crafty ruler. Early in the year, Henry fell from his horse while jousting and lay unconscious for two hours. This accident aggravated ulcers in his legs that would plague him for the remainder of his life, ending his days of jousting and hunting and leading to the ballooning waistline for which he is famous. The fall may have ‘bruised his cerebral cortex’ (58) and perhaps led to Anne’s miscarriage five days later. It may also have left the king ‘increasingly anxious and irascible, easily irritated and prone to rage’ (61). This was certainly Henry’s *annus horribilis* (46).

Whether these events ‘changed’ the king is another question, and one about which Lipscomb herself is guarded, noting that she and her publishers ‘quibbled over the word “changed” in the title.’ She admits that this year came ‘after his “divorce” from Katherine of Aragon, his marriage to Anne Boleyn, the Acts of Supremacy and Succession and the deaths of Thomas More and Bishop John Fisher’, events which are often seen as equivalent markers of the king’s decline into tyranny (13). To this caveat might be added others: Henry’s cruelty was arguably on full display in the second year of his reign,

¹ Steven Gunn, ‘The structures of politics in early Tudor England’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser., v (1995), 59.