Montaigne chercherait à combler un manque: 1) amorce du projet des *Essais*, (surtout) l'ami perdu; 2) pendant l'écriture, la connaissance de soi. Rétif au cloisonnement, Montaigne vagabonde/écrit en dépit des genres et unités érigés de nouveau par les néo-aristotéliens. Son style coupé, sautillant comme celui de l'Arioste (p. 159), accompagne une recherche mélancolique de son identité qui évoquerait celle du chevalier de la Mancha.

Cet ensemble d'explications de textes a surtout le mérite de signaler que le mode d'intervention de "simples" modernes dans l'écriture des *Essais* est, paradoxalement, le même que celui des Autorités anciennes: l'*imitatio*, et que la quête identitaire de l'auteur Montaigne passe par des terres occupées tantôt par les uns, tantôt par les autres. Malgré la puissance des analogies, le nombre des détails semblables ainsi que les correspondances de disposition, on peut, certes, questionner la nécessaire pertinence d'une ou deux des étiologies proposées (le paysage de Bruegel, par exemple). Après le "diligent lecteur" de Montaigne, souvent sollicité dans ce livre, un autre surgit alors des *Essais*: "J'ay leu en Tite-Live cent choses que tel n'y a pas leu. Plutarque en y a leu cent, outre ce que j'y ai sceu lire, et, à l'aventure, outre ce que l'autheur y avoit mis" (I, 26, 156c). Ce qui ne diminue en rien l'admiration de Montaigne pour Plutarque.

Enfin, cet excellent ouvrage de recherche rend explicite, aussi, le processus par lequel Mary McKinley prépare le texte (son regard, son découpage), ainsi que les étapes d'une analyse de la présence des modernes, de sorte qu'il ouvre et balise la voie pour tout explorateur éventuel de ces "terrains vagues."

MICHEL LIDDLE, *Université d'Ottawa*

Leah S. Marcus. *Unediting the Renaissance: Shakespeare, Marlowe, Milton*. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Pp. xi, 268.

The late-1980s and 90s have seen increasing attention directed to practices of edition-making. In *Unediting the Renaissance*, Leah Marcus approaches the early modern text by focusing upon material history and examining selected sixteenth- and seventeenth-century works, including multiple-text plays of Shakespeare, Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, and the poetry of Herbert and Milton. Marcus argues that in many instances the material text itself encodes meaning; she suggests that to undervalue material signification, usually lost in the fashioning of modern editions, is to miss the inscribed point, which is often a component of design. However, the agency of such design is a vexed subject, as Marcus occasionally allows.

Marcus begins the unediting process by examining editorial treatments of a three-word phrase in Shakespeare's *The Tempest*, Prospero's description of Caliban's mother Sycorax as a "blew ey'd hag" (TLN 396). Marcus considers the various ways in which nineteenth- and twentieth-century editors have explained

the phrase in its usually modernized form. "In nearly all modern editions," she argues, "blue-eyed" "is glossed in a way that cancels out its potential for disrupting the self/other binary that has characterized most readings of the play" (p. 6). Marcus' survey of multiple interpretive possibilities opens up both the phrase and Prospero's discursive act, and draws attention to editorial understanding as subject to cultural, historical, and linguistic predisposition.

A section of the Introduction titled "The New Philology" (pp. 17–25) provides a thumbnail history of modern editorial practices, which are described as taking place in three stages, beginning in the late nineteenth century and stretching into the present. The first of these stages, an "evolutionary and progressive" model of authorship (p. 17), was superseded by New Criticism and New Bibliography (which folded together two ideas, text as artefact and bibliography as "science"); this model, in turn, has been challenged by the New Philology, in which the "dominant textual paradigm . . . can be characterized as a network" (p. 23). Marcus borrows Thomas Kuhn's conception of a "paradigm shift" to signal the sea changes that different methodologies and perspectives have brought to bear on textual representations. The present, she argues, brings with it an imperative: "what is required is closer attention to micro-investigation of literary texts in their local and historically contingent forms" (p. 25). In short, Marcus' Introduction provides a model, sketches in a view of history, and launches a game plan.

In the second chapter, which addresses the "A" and "B" texts of *Doctor Faustus* (first printed in 1604 and 1616, respectively), Marcus argues that the "different versions of the play carry different ideological freight" (p. 42). It is not simply a question of aesthetic superiority; equally important, she suggests, are alternative representations of religious practice and disposition. Radical Protestantism was associated with "Wertenberg," Faustus' adopted home in the "A" text, while conservative Anglican orthodoxy is associated with "Wittenberg," the more familiar alternative that appears in "B." Marcus' observation concerning a provocative variant and its resonance draws attention to the potential cost of moving too quickly to amend "A" with reference to "B." She then expands upon her introductory gambit, arguing that the more radical theology of "A" might be seen elsewhere in the 1604 version. At the same time, she acknowledges that the "B" text's "placement of the magician within a ceremonial context dangerously like England's own official style of worship would have been provocative in the extreme" (pp. 61–62). Both versions might be understood to challenge religious orthodoxy, and the "Marlowe effect," differently inscribed, is alive in each.

In the chapter entitled "Bad Taste and Bad *Hamlet*," Marcus imports the orality/literacy binary, and attempts to argue that as *Hamlet* texts move forward in time — from Q1 (1603) through Q2 (1604–5) and F1 (1623) — one begins to see a phenomenon that might be described as a shift from a more "oral" text (Q1) toward increasingly "literate" texts (Q2 and F1). Her argument depends upon a stable relationship between printed text and date, but the relation of any of these

texts to prior (manuscript?) copy is unknown; one cannot reasonably assume that the dates appearing on printed copies establish temporal sequence.

In order to explore the differences between the Q1 version and later versions of Hamlet's soliloquy, "To be or not to be," Marcus shifts her attention to "actors and directors" (p. 152). Christopher McCullough, who appeared in a Q1 *Hamlet* in 1982 at the University College of Swansea, suggests that the Q1 version of the soliloquy "only made sense if I said it to the audience" (p. 154). McCullough makes a compelling case for the value of Q1 as a performance text of *Hamlet*; however, as a springboard for Marcus' argument concerning priority, the actor's testimony falls short. More important, the discussion of the theoretical applicability of "orality" and "literacy" as mapped onto the plays is brief and unpersuasive. As the chapter proceeds, Marcus relies more and more heavily upon the terms "conjecture" and "hypothesis," and constructions such as "it is possible that . . .," and in the final pages of the chapter she acknowledges the scope of her "extended speculations" (p. 168).

In the final chapter, Marcus extends her discussion of the material text to non-dramatic literature, and different arguments come into play. For example, she explores conceptions of the book as body, as well as the significance of front matter (including visual representations of the author) and differences among alternative editions. Editorial issues are central to Marcus' consideration because, in her view, when it comes to printed collections of poetry, in particular, "modern editions undermine [the] configurations of authorial identity offered in early modern printed materials" (p. 180). Marcus efficiently exposes an irony associated with the New Bibliography. She argues that by erasing signs of the material text, editors erase the very authorial identity they seek to reconstitute, for materiality often encodes meaning. The argument that underlies this claim concerns whether or not the writers in question (are known to have) participated in determining the material forms that specific collections assumed.

The argument concerning Herbert's familiar shaped poem, "Easter Wings," is incisive and accomplished. In this case, shape is clearly crucial to meaning, for "[o]nce the symbolic equivalence between book and wings is established, the reader's turning of the leaves of the book becomes parallel to the motion of the wings in flight as they lead the soul to God" (p. 182). This is an interesting example, for it establishes a compelling relationship among configuration, materiality, and meaning.

Unediting the Renaissance includes both good arguments and provocative hypotheses in its efforts to explore the materiality of early modern texts. While some conjectures are less persuasive, many of the arguments effect a rethinking of the role of the editor as maker, and an interrogation of the significance of textual features that for far too long have been taken for granted.

DALE CHURCHWARD, *Upper Canada College*