toutes ces auteures tendent au même but, c'est-à-dire à la mise en valeur d'une certaine liberté sexuelle des femmes, et ceci en prenant le contrôle de leur propre corps à l'encontre des hommes et de leurs désirs.

Cet ouvrage permet au lecteur de se faire une très bonne idée d'ensemble de ce que serait une écriture de femme à la Renaissance française. A ce propos, Anne Larsen et Colette Winn, dans l'introduction qu'elles cosignent, offrent une synthèse éclairante qui permet d'établir les particularités de cette activité scripturaire. Il reste à signaler qu'à la fin du recueil se trouvent un tableau chronologique des événements historiques et des oeuvres publiées en France de 1492 à 1626, une bibliographie des femmes écrivains étudiées ainsi qu'une sélection des ouvrages critiques qui leur ont déjà été consacrés, une liste des auteurs ayant contribué un article et finalement un index onomastique et par sujet. Toutes ces annexes facilitent grandement la consultation de l'ouvrage.

HÉLÈNE LUCUIX, Université de Montréal

Jeanne Shami. John Donne's 1622 Gunpowder Plot Sermon: A Parallel Text Edition. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1996. Pp. xii, 200.

It is a story of scholarly serendipity — this discovery of an autograph manuscript (the only autograph manuscript) of an important Donne sermon, and Jeanne Shami tells it well. She makes a cogent case for the significance of the manuscript that she discovered almost accidentally during a scan of the British Library's sermon manuscripts. She saw at once that the unattributed MS Royal 17.B.XX was a scribal copy of Donne's 1622 Gunpowder Anniversary Sermon on Lamentations 4.20, but she only gradually came to realize that many of the corrections were in Donne's hand. The present publication is the hard copy of that exciting (and excitingly narrated) discovery. It contains a facsimile and transcription of the manuscript on facing pages and a listing on each page of all the differences between this version and the one subsequently printed. There is thus material available for a double comparison: for the kinds of changes made near the moment of the sermon's delivery and for those made subsequently when it was revised with other sermons for publication. There are also tables indicating definite, probable, and possible autograph changes, and an introduction that is both descriptive and polemical. It is a pleasing volume to handle and consult. The transcription is very well set out, allowing a reader not expert in Renaissance hands to read it with ease, to see the corrections at once, and, also, to see detail not visible on microfilm.

There are a number of printed versions of this manuscript: the original 1649 publication, *Fifty Sermons*, prepared by Donne's son; a nineteenth-century version; and the Potter and Simpson ten-volume edition of Donne's sermons. Moreover, not

all newly discovered manuscripts, even ones that differ in significant details from the printed versions, get editions of their own. Yet there are a number of reasons for publishing this manuscript. That Donne's hand is in it automatically gives it importance; for one thing, one can see the process of revision close up and get a sense of Donne's method of composition as well as his attention to textual detail, even if it may often be "difficult to interpret the meaning and significance of his corrections." Because James I requested a copy, it was transcribed, proofread and corrected within weeks of its delivery. But comparing this version with the one subsequently printed shows many significant alterations. Further, as Shami points out, since most sermons were delivered orally, usually from notes and only written down after delivery, little is known about the relation between what was said and what was printed. With the publication of this manuscript we now have an instrument to explore this relation, a process that opens up the issues, both textual and historical, which are discussed in the "Introduction."

That discussion begins by rendering problematic the very act of "editing" this manuscript. In a theoretical context defined in part by Foucault's theory of the author function (MS Royal 17.B.XX suddenly becomes important because it is no longer unattributed but now bears the name of Donne), and by Jerome McGann's theory of the social text, Shami discusses issues of authorship and intentionality. She justifies her decision to produce a documentary edition insofar as it can provide data for the study of the manuscript itself and for understanding its relationship to the first printed version, so that, as she quotes McGann, "different ends of textual criticism can be facilitated." We are given a detailed bibliographic description, an assessment of Donne's method of preparing a sermon for distribution based on an examination of the different kinds of corrections, and a history of the sermon's transmission through its various printed states. Here she engages directly with Potter and Simpson, who only had printed versions of this sermon available when preparing their edition and so had no choice but to take the 1649 folio as their copy text. However, since they extrapolated their editorial principles for handling all the folio texts from the manuscripts available to them, that is for 16 of the 160 sermons, some of their assumptions become debatable in the light of the evidence provided by this manuscript. As well, she shows how many of their emendations, especially concerning punctuation, are arbitrary. Shami, of course, does not have to make such choices, for hers is a transcription. Yet she is keenly aware of the implications of such choices when she compares the two states of the sermon. My only criticism here is that it would be much easier for the reader if the line numbers were keyed to Potter and Simpson as well. In the text, only the manuscript lineation is used; and in the "Introduction," when comparisons are made, the Folio lineation is often used and Potter and Simpson very occasionally. But most readers would only have ready access to that version and such keying throughout would be a great help.

It is when the argument moves to a comparison of the manuscript with the published sermon that something of the polemical undertone of the introduction becomes audible. The passages that were added or recast, Shami argues, "indicate more clearly Donne's political intentions in his earlier version, and what he cautiously refrained from spelling out at the time of delivery ... [I]n 1622 he was wary of criticizing the King as openly as he did in the revised version." Indeed these revisions are seen as "significant enough to constitute a second 'version' of this sermon." They are placed in a variety of contexts: the August 1622 issue of James's Directions for Preachers; the pro-Spanish foreign policy; the crisis of counsel centering on Buckingham; the significance of the sermon's occasion on Donne's anti-Catholicism; the shift in political climate after the accession of Charles. I am not so much disputing the arguments offered here as suggesting that the issues are not entirely contextualized, or, possibly, the audience for this introductory essay is not clearly enough in focus. The Stuart historian, the textual scholar, the student of seventeenth-century literature, all come to such a text with very different backgrounds, and the latter two, for example, might need a fuller accounting of these contexts, especially since much of the point of the "Introduction" is to read the sermon locally as it might have been understood both in November 1622 and sometime after the accession of Charles (this of course assumes that this is when "Donne might have revised and amplified his sermon" [my emphasis]).

As well, current discussions about the nature of James's rule and Donne's response to that rule could have been engaged more directly, for an odd feature of this introduction is one's sense that a debate is being carried on, but the other team is just out of earshot. Footnote 12 provides an instance. There, a group of scholars is cited as providing "reevaluations of Donne's politics." But what are the implied standard evaluations? Who argues for them? Why? What seems to be at issue here is the question of Donne's so called absolutism, and this reading with its emphasis on Donne's criticism of the King, however muted and guarded, is very much on the anti-absolutist side. I find myself closer to that position than not, closer to David Norbrook, Annabel Patterson, Jeanne Shami herself, than to Debora Shuger, John Cary, Jonathan Goldberg, or more recently, Richard Strier, for example. Shami would certainly take issue with Shuger's statement that "Donne's God, his preaching, and his king are all analogously related, all participants in absolutist structures of domination and submission" (Habits of Thought, Berkeley, 1990, p. 209). Still, such a position might be identified, at least as a context for discussion.

But these are points by the way and certainly do not detract from the great accomplishment witnessed in these pages. There is so much excellent material here, so much meticulous hard work, so thoughtful a probing and marshalling of the evidence, that Donne scholars will be a long time in her debt.

JUDITH SCHERER HERZ, Concordia University