

THE
**SIXTEENTH
CENTURY
JOURNAL**
The Journal of Early Modern Studies

Review: [untitled]

Author(s): William J. Kennedy

Reviewed work(s):

Canon, Period, and the Poetry of Charles of Orleans by A. E. B. Coldiron

Source: *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Spring, 2002), pp. 308-309

Published by: The Sixteenth Century Journal

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4144321>

Accessed: 19/01/2009 18:17

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=scj>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Sixteenth Century Journal is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Sixteenth Century Journal*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

seventeenth-century Spain (and Europe at large), Cervantes' characters deal with their often precarious circumstances through the various socioeconomic exchanges that make them renounce the old world order in favor of a new world order. Johnson's is indeed a work on Cervantes that will aid Cervantistas and Hispanists in general to better understand the historical circumstances of Cervantes' time.

Patricia Vilches Lawrence University

Canon, Period, and the Poetry of Charles of Orleans. A. E. B. Coldiron. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000. 224 pp. \$47.50. ISBN 0472111469.

This succinct, engagingly written book studies Charles of Orleans' French, English, and Latin poetry as a challenge to literary history and theory, and particularly to categories of periodization imposed monoculturally on national literatures. This French nobleman of royal blood, nephew of Charles V, father of Louis XII, and uncle of Francis I, was captured by his British cousin Henry V at the battle of Agincourt in 1415 and spent the next twenty-five years in England, notably with the duke of Suffolk whose wife was Chaucer's granddaughter. There he translated 141 of his French *ballades* into English lyrics with marked differences in style and tone for his foreign hosts. Afterwards, in an evident bid to assure a worldwide and permanent readership, he supervised translations of his French poems into a bilingual Latin edition, again with important tonal differences. A. E. B. Coldiron argues that a "polysystems effect" (188) inevitably occurs as the translator connects two or more cultural discourses or literary systems that exist in different states or stages. In the case of Charles' self-translations from French to English, this effect poses a double challenge that confronts the poet as "a four-faced Janus" (146). With respect to his native literature, Charles is perceived as a late medieval poet whose lyrics recall and exhaust Troubadour and Trouvère conventions. With respect to English literature, he could be perceived as a forerunner of practices that entered into the national canon in the Tudor era with Wyatt, Watson, and Sidney. This generates a problem for our understanding of literary and linguistic dynamics in the fifteenth century.

Coldiron extends her argument from the context of translation, through the apparent paradox of a "translated" subjectivity that registers different effects in different languages, to the formation of diverse guidelines for forming canons in various literary histories. She directs a fine chapter on translation to matters concerning "the social politics of language" (20) where cultural discontinuities between the original and target languages force the translator to make choices that reflect metadifferences between them. French lyric convention prescribes allegory as "its main figurative method and chief among its organizing principles" while English practice "moves definitively away from abstraction and allegory toward concreteness, metaphor, and real lyric conceit" (34). The effect on Charles' creation of an early modern "I" dominates another fine chapter. Here Coldiron construes the lyric self as a construction built upon linguistic, generic, and literary-historical conventions. The latter appear normative and therefore not subjectively revealing in French discourse, but they translate into English with an increased sense of the presence of a lyric self, dramatizing "an overheard moment" in the later manner of a Sidney, a Donne, or a Browning (57). Whether these effects derive from Charles' attempt to record "actual speaking voices he heard around him during his captivity," they surely result from "intersecting requirements of syntax, vocabulary, and meter" in the English language (66).

In yet another informative chapter Coldiron focuses on the hard-core materials of manuscripts and the documented reception of Charles' English. Charles' reputation has al-

ways been secure in the canon of French literary history, but in England, despite an astonishingly high number of surviving manuscripts, he appears at best a “minor” poet in the wake of Chaucer. A persistent anti-French sentiment in English letters through the eighteenth century no doubt accounts for some coolness in his reception. Not until Thomas Park exercised his “romanticizing early-nineteenth-century imagination” on the texts (103) did Charles emerge as a respected poet in English, though Park placed an undue emphasis on the saccharine qualities of his verse. Such nationalistic pressures ironically undercut Charles’ own efforts to secure for himself a position in world literature by translating his poetry into Latin. Coldiron devotes an appreciative chapter to this translation and especially to its concluding emphasis on his political and moral poems about war, peace, politics, and patriotism. Here Charles’ famous “Complainte de France,” when compared with Petrarch’s “Italia mia,” reveals “a subliminal tension” between French patriotism and the claims to cosmopolitanism implied in the collection (143). As so often in his amatory poetry Charles displays a temperament that is strikingly anti-Petrarchan, aimed not at “a higher religious or philosophical matter” as with his Italian predecessor, but at “a contingent mode” reflecting “some immediate or political pressures” (177). Even in this respect Charles challenges conventional pieties about periodization as he shuns the model of Petrarch’s *Rime Sparse* that would soon dominate European poetry. Coldiron puts this complex history into a wonderful perspective as she explores each angle with precision and discrimination. *Canon, Period, and the Poetry of Charles of Orleans* is a provocative book that will amply reward students of late medieval and early modern English and French literature and cultural history.

William J. Kennedy **Cornell University**

Rhetoric, Rhetoricians and Poets. Marijke Spies. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 2000. 155 pp. \$25.00. ISBN 9053564004.

In this deceptively slim volume of twelve concise essays Marijke Spies demonstrates her imposing knowledge of and expertise in the field of Renaissance rhetoric in Europe. The essays range from the close reading of a single work (Ronsard’s *Hymne de l’Or*) through the careful analysis of a single genre or author (sixteenth-century French morality plays; seventeenth-century Amsterdam School-Orations; J. C. Scaliger; Joost van den Vondel), to overviews of the literary production by specific groups (women; Mennonites; Amsterdam’s Chamber of Rhetoric *De Eglentier*). All twelve essays were previously published in other venues between 1982 and 1999, and were collected here to celebrate Spies’ retirement from the Free University in Amsterdam in 1999. As one might expect from essays written over time for different purposes (and in different rhetorical styles), the scholarly discourse is somewhat uneven: the chapter on Mennonites provides a general bibliography but no notes; the essay on “Developments in Sixteenth-Century Dutch Poetics” has eighty-three footnotes; the chapter on “Women and Seventeenth-Century Dutch Literature,” no references at all. This last chapter has become outdated (though it is the only one), for scholarship on Netherlandic women’s literature, some of it by Spies herself, has advanced significantly over the last decade. Useful would have been the addition of a note with some reference to that scholarship, at a minimum to the publication in 1997 of *Met en zonder lauwerkrans*, a spectacular volume on women’s literature in the Low Countries prior to 1850 (also by Amsterdam University Press).

A strength of the collection is Spies’ genial ability to capture and convey the uniqueness of Dutch Renaissance literature. In discussing the poetry of Dutch Mennonites, Spies uses the term “spiritual didactics” (99) and observes that its characteristic movement is