Miranda draws several conclusions concerning the legacy of the *tragedia sacra*. First, she notes that, unlike the Spanish Jesuit theater of the day, this genre remained faithful to the tragic register valorized in humanist university circles. She goes on to demonstrate convincingly that the earliest performances of Jesuit theater in Rome were two of Venegas’s works, *Achabus*, in 1562, followed by *Saul Gelboeus*, in 1566. They were greatly acclaimed by Jesuit leadership for their rhetorical sophistication, didacticism, and decorous performances, to the extent that they served as an archetypal reference point when the leadership laid out the standards that other playwrights should emulate. While Venegas’s choice to renounce his Jesuit vows helped obscure authorship of his works after his exit, Miranda recoups a pivotal spot for him as the father of Jesuit theater in Portugal and as the creator of a dramatic standard which influenced the theatrical productions the brotherhood hoped to realize worldwide.

Finally, Miranda’s archival research on the choruses for tragedies created to accompany Venegas’s early *tragedias sacras* is especially strong. She examines the remarkable relationship between Venegas and the choral master Francisco de Santa María, whose collaboration gave rise to choruses distinguished by the *mos tragicus*, or the use of a new homophonic style and melodic structure to emphasize the declamatory impact of their lyrics. Additionally, they incorporated chorus singers as characters in the play through costumes and by positioning them onstage. These discoveries help locate the origins of Jesuit musical theater in the use of music to complement the rhetorical sophistication of tragic verse.

Although at times Miranda could give more credit to Spanish Jesuit theater’s didactic potential and aesthetic achievements, her work validates Venegas’s extraordinary contributions to early modern theater by identifying him as the creator of the dramatic archetype of the *tragedia sacra*. Intriguingly, she also notes that the *tragedia sacra*’s emphasis on the stylistic features of its rhetoric foreshadows the coming Baroque aesthetic. Overall, this book offers helpful insights into the interplay of Neo-Latin university theater and Jesuit dramaturgy through the lens of the singular life and talent of Miguel Venegas, whose contributions to his artistic community left a lasting impact.

Brandan Grayson, *Anderson University*
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*Advertising the Self in Renaissance France: Lemaire, Marot, and Rabelais.*
Scott Francis.

In this latest contribution to the new but already successful Early Modern Exchange series from University of Delaware Press, Scott Francis provides a fascinating look at
the early printing trade in France, adroitly connecting it to the birth of modern advertising. Related to this is the self-fashioning of authorial (as well as a printer’s) identity—prestige advertising—and the use of captatio benevolentiae and paratextual front matter that seeks to define the ideal reader. Francis rightly insists that rhetoric and self-fashioning are inseparable, and that rhetorical persuasion represents the first form of advertising. Overall, this is an engaging and ambitious project that focuses on the creation of authorial personas by three canonical authors from the first half of the sixteenth century: Jean Lemaire de Belges, Clément Marot, and François Rabelais. The book’s structure is very straightforward, with two chapters dedicated to each author.

Francis begins with the evolution of the author’s position as works move from manuscript to print culture. This transition leaves authors with a feeling of unease, fearful of losing control of one’s work. Referencing the famous prologue of Rabelais’s Tiers livre, Francis emphasizes the risks for both authors and printers. The dangers were greater for printers, who were more likely to get in trouble in cases of faulty or heretical publications. Advertising the Self tells an engaging story about the three authors and connects their stories to theories about advertising, prestige publishing, and self-fashioning by both authors and printers. Francis focuses heavily on the paratextual front matter of the works. In the first section, on Lemaire, likely the least familiar to readers, Francis lays out Lemaire’s overarching strategy to privilege French historiography over Italian lyric, with his Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye portrayed as superior to Petrarchan lyric poetry. Throughout his publications, Lemaire subtly crafts his ideal, sympathetic reader through a variety of rhetorical techniques.

Francis’s analysis of unauthorized editions of authors’ works, typically ignored by scholars, represents one of his most valuable contributions, especially in the case of the poet Clément Marot. His reasons for doing this are convincing, and it provides a new perspective on the production and reception of these works. (He also includes an appendix with all of the editions, both authorized and unauthorized, of Marot’s works.) As Francis correctly concludes, contradicting a long-held view on the poet, “Marot’s trajectory was not a shift from the frivolous to the serious, but one in which the frivolous and the serious consistently worked in concert with one another” (133–34). Part of what makes this section (and the book in general) so interesting is the detailed information it provides about the printing history of Marot’s poetry.

Of the three authors examined in Advertising the Self, by far the one most studied is François Rabelais. Entering into the scholarly debates surrounding Rabelais requires one to read a hefty amount of scholarship, and Francis demonstrates a thorough understanding of the main critical debates among Rabelais specialists. While I do not agree with some of his explanations about episodes from Pantagruel, his arguments are always cogent and considered, and I find his overall argument about Rabelais’s rhetorical efforts to establish a complex relationship with his readers compelling. In the final chapter, Francis goes full circle, connecting Rabelais to Lemaire and noting the differences between Rabelais’s ironic advertising strategy and Lemaire’s much more earnest stance.
Francis’s knowledge of these authors and the printers who published their works is impressive. Advertising the Self is a well-edited and highly readable book that sheds new light on these three important authors from the early decades of the book trade in Renaissance France.

Bruce Hayes, University of Kansas
doi:10.1017/rqx.2020.395


Both of these books make meaningful and welcome contributions to our understanding of Geoffrey Chaucer’s reception in early modern England. Cook examines the “unique” way that sixteenth-century English “antiquaries” set Chaucer in a “temporal doubleness” (19). In the way they formatted and designed the large folios of Chaucer’s collected works, determined the poet’s canon, and wrote about the man himself, they reimagined the father figure of fifteenth-century poets as, instead, the father of modern English history and language, as well as a prophet of Protestantism: “He is a figure from the past who retains his importance precisely because he is perceived as not being fully of the past. Instead, Chaucer prefigures what is still to come, both prophetically in his writing and historically by the act of writing such poetically and ideologically advanced material at an early date” (76).

Cook’s first chapter relates the printing history of the three major editions of Chaucer—William Thynne’s (1532, 1542, and 1550), John Stow’s (1561), and Thomas Speght’s (1598, 1602)—and begins two lines of inquiry that continue into subsequent chapters: the cultural work these Works perform, and how for these antiquarians Chaucer’s poetic achievement is largely linguistic, rather than literary. In the second chapter she surveys Leland’s De Viris Illustribus (On famous men), showing how he reconstitutes the son of a vintner as an Oxford- and Inns of Court–educated intellectual, which “places him on a par” with the likes of Dante and Petrarch (56). For Cook, Leland is a foundational figure for establishing Chaucer’s exceptionality; he is, for instance, Speght’s “primary source” for the biography he writes for the Works (45). But as her third chapter shows, that story passes through John Bale and, especially, John Foxe, who in their own ways both illustrate Cook’s thesis and themselves participate in determining the trajectory of the story she tells. Foxe, for instance, believed that