outstanding historian, he is a recognized expert in Luther's thought. The reader who approaches this volume seeking to benefit from that expertise will not be disappointed. From a different angle, the last two articles, as the seasoned reflections of an accomplished historian who delights equally in his craft and in humour, are sprightly treatments of the joys and foibles of "doing" history. Citations from ponderous authorities jostle those from "Peanuts" characters as Professor Spitz manifests his great love for the discipline to which he has contributed so significantly.

The volume under review makes readily accessible valuable studies of significant questions in the broad categories of education and history in the Reformation era. While research libraries may already have these articles in various books and journals in their collections, this volume pulls them together within one book's covers. Consequently, many libraries will want to add it to their collection; undoubtedly, numerous scholars in Reformation era studies will do the same.

JAMES R. PAYTON, JR., *Redeemer College*

David J. Baker. *Between Nations: Shakespeare, Spenser, Marvell, and the Question of Britain*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997. Pp. xii, 221.

Outlining the scope of *Between Nations: Shakespeare, Spenser, Marvell, and the Question of Britain*, David Baker writes, "I attempt to read — or, often, to reread — certain instances of early modern English literature in light of the premises and imperatives of the developing British historiography. The texts with which I am most concerned are William Shakespeare's *Henry V* (1599), Edmund Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1598), and Andrew Marvell's 'An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland' (1598), as well as his "The Loyal-Scot" (circa 1670)" (p. 7). Central to Baker's attempt to (re)read these texts, then, is his indebtedness to the new British historiography, in particular the seminal essays of J. G. A. Pocock. Following Pocock's lead, historians of the early modern period have begun to study the uneasy process of British state-formation in the early modern period, a process triggered by the Tudor "incorporation" of Wales and Ireland and culminating in the Anglo-Scottish Act of Union. If the new British historiography has forced historians to re-evaluate the political history of the period, it has also paved the way for literary historians to glean valuable new perspectives on literary and extra-literary texts in light of the wider British context that informed, indeed enabled, their production. Literary scholars, to be sure, are addressing the question of Britain, though their work has been restricted primarily to Spenser, who wrote most of his works while living in Ireland, and Shakespeare, whose "national" history plays register a deep anxiety about an expanding English polity that included and incorporated Wales, an intractable Ireland, and an encroaching Scotland. Although this book is somewhat limited in terms of the authors and texts it studies,

it serves as a signal contribution to the construction of a less anglocentric approach to writers and readers throughout the British Isles. In fact, this book is remarkable precisely because it brings a non-anglocentric historiography — a truly plural history of the various inhabitants of the British Isles: English, Irish, Scottish, Welsh — to bear on the literary history of early modernity.

“The Britain that I want to chart in *Between Nations*,” the author writes, “is less a fixed and distinct domain than an ontological predicament, a knot of conundrums entangling the several peoples who in the early modern period were compelled to share ‘that island lying off the northwestern coast of geographic Europe’” (p. 8). Nowhere is this more evident than in the opening chapter, “Imagining Britain: William Shakespeare’s *Henry V*,” which counters interpretations (in particular, Stephen Greenblatt’s) that reduce the play to a piece of English/British propaganda: “a piece of Jacobean propaganda for union *avant la lettre*” (p. 21). Baker explores the emergence of a “proto-Britain” in *Henry V*; that is, he reads the play, which was performed in 1599 (sometime between Essex’s departure to and return from war-ravaged Ireland), as a sustained reflection on the question of Britain, the question of England’s tenuous “incorporation” of the “Celtic Fringe.” By drawing attention to the ways in which the representation of two of the play’s “diverse cast of British types” (p. 21) — Fluellen the Welshman and MacMorris the Irishman — unsettles a stable, unified English self, Baker accentuates the on-going articulations of Britishness, and in doing so highlights the intricate identities of the various inhabitants of the British Isles. Of particular importance here is MacMorris’s “over-determined identity” (p. 39). Focusing on MacMorris’s “What ish my nation” speech, as well as the case of the historical English/Irish officer Christopher St. Lawrence, Baker warns against ascribing simplistic, essentialist identities to the play’s characters; instead, he teases out their hybridity. MacMorris (a Gaelicization of FitzMaurice), for instance, is identified as a descendant of the Anglo-Norman conquerors who settled in Ireland in the twelfth century. Fluellen, however, seems to regard him as “irish.” Historians would label MacMorris Old English. For Baker, MacMorris is between nations. Baker’s interpretation of the play is enriched by an awareness of the multiple texts of *Henry V*: the 1600 Quarto and the 1623 Folio editions. Surprisingly, however, he says nothing about the Queen of France’s unsettling reference to Henry as “brother Ireland” (sig. h2, TLN 289), a passage that was emended to “brother England” in the Second Folio of 1632 and has remained so in all ensuing editions (excluding the recent publication of Barbara Mowat and Paul Werstine’s New Folger edition of the play).

In his introduction, Baker contrasts his study of the question of Britain to Richard Helgerson’s work on English nation-fashioning in his *Forms of Nationhood: The Elizabethan Writing of England*. Helgerson’s focus on the writing of England, Baker argues, elides the fact that English political expansion across the British Isles created “an extraordinary complex intercultural site” (p. 13). This is particularly evident in Helgerson’s reading of Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene*, which

says little or nothing about Spenser's Irish experience. Unlike Helgerson, Baker destabilizes the insular English identity that both historians and literary historians often (un)consciously reinscribe in their work. Indeed, Baker immerses Spenser in the cultural politics of Elizabethan Ireland, Spenser's "home" from 1580 to 1598. The second chapter, "Border Crossings: Edmund Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland*," treats Spenser's prose dialogue, long considered an anti-Gaelic screed, as an intercultural (that is, British) text. Spenser's *View* was entered into the Stationers' Register in 1598; it did not appear in print, however, until 1633, when the Dublin antiquarian and historian Sir James Ware included it in his *Ancient Irish Chronicles*. Attempting to account for the *View*'s "continued suppression" (p. 70), Baker provides a subtle reading of Spenser's subversive thoughts on English common law and Gaelic, or Breton law, which turn out to be oddly similar. Spenser, we are told, "had a specific (though oblique) argument to make: the law that England imposed on Ireland could not establish royal control, first, because it was not thoroughly enforced, but, more disturbingly, because the law had its own ambiguous affinity with Gaelic law, and this left it open to hostile appropriation" (p. 91). Spenser's solution, according to Baker: "[Law] must always be remade by a monarch who, unhindered by the constraints of accumulated custom, can fit the law to present exigency" (p. 110). By situating Spenser's text in the complex colonial milieu in which it was written, Baker, it seems, paints a portrait of Spenser's politics that differs significantly from Helgerson's, who sees Spenser as a champion of aristocratic autonomy. What Baker and Helgerson have in common, though, is an awareness of Spenser's ambivalent representations of royal power. But because Helgerson's name never surfaces in this chapter, we never get a sense of how Baker sees his own close reading of Spenser's *View* in relation to Helgerson's work. This chapter demonstrates what a less anglocentric approach to Spenser offers readers. However, it could have included a more explicit commentary on how the critic's historical sources determine or inform his/her reading.

The final chapter, "British Poetics: Andrew Marvell's 'An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland' and 'The Loyal Scot,'" considers "a kind of poetics at which [Marvell] excelled": namely, "introduc[ing] himself into the terms of a debate in order to deploy himself among its uncertainties" (p. 168). The uncertain categories to which Baker refers are Britishness and homosexuality. This chapter complicates received narratives about Marvell's political toadyism and his alleged homosexuality. Rather than uncovering Marvell's political allegiances, instead of establishing Marvell's sexual orientation as queer or straight, Baker reads these two poems in light of the homosocial British politics that brought them into being. The result is an astute analysis of the intertwining discourses — cultural, political, sexual — underpinning Marvell's articulations of the "interisland conundrum" (p. 127) that beset both Cromwell's and Charles II's rule. Like the previous chapters, this one contains a thoroughly historical and deeply theoretical investiga-

tion of British questions. Baker's wonderfully smooth and elegant prose, it should be pointed out, makes this book a pleasure to read.

CHRISTOPHER IVIC, *University of Western Ontario*

Jeanne de Schomberg. *Règlement donné par une dame de haute qualité à M*** sa petite fille, pour sa conduite, et pour celle de sa maison: avec un autre règlement que cette dame avait dressé pour elle-mesme*. Édition critique par Colette H. Winn. Paris, Honoré Champion, 1997.

Inconnue du grand public, Jeanne de Schomberg, duchesse de Liancourt (1600–1674), partage le destin de beaucoup de femmes-écrivains longtemps oubliées. C'est à Colette H. Winn qu'elle doit de voir son nom rappelé par la publication d'une édition critique de son ouvrage dont le long titre suffit pour indiquer l'époque de sa composition.

Le livre qui est l'objet de notre lecture s'ouvre par une longue "introduction" (pp. 7–37), terminée par une énumération bibliographique des "Éditions et principes d'établissement du texte" (pp. 37–42). Un frontispice occupant l'espace d'une page précède ensuite un long "Avertissement" (pp. 47–74), écrit par J. J. Boileau. Suit une courte préface insérée par la duchesse elle-même (pp. 77–79) et l'on passe enfin à la version essentielle de son ouvrage, à savoir à une série d'articles intitulés "Lettres" adressées à sa fille (pp. 81–172). Il y a encore d'autres articles où la duchesse développe le "Règlement" que "cette dame [...] avait dressé pour elle-mesme" (pp. 173–186). Un appendice apporte trois courts poèmes, tirés du *Recueil de vers choisis*, publié le R. P. Bouhours à Paris en 1693, après la mort de la duchesse. Une liste qui propose des ouvrages éducatifs à l'usage des femmes (pp. 191–198) augmente la valeur bibliographique du livre.

Si l'on a consacré ce paragraphe à la table des matières, c'est que celle-ci doit remplacer, du moins en partie, les inévitables longueurs dont la richesse exclut d'avance les comptes rendus plus détaillés. Dans cette situation, il paraît plus utile de se borner à des fragments qui, du point de vue de notre temps, nous semblent plus caractéristiques ou importants.

Issue d'une famille originaire d'Allemagne, M^{me} de Liancourt est fille de Françoise d'Espinay et de Henri de Schomberg, grand maître de l'artillerie et surintendant des finances, qui après deux ans d'exercice de ses fonctions se trouva moins riche qu'auparavant. Mariée à un homme plutôt léger, elle le soigna dans ses maladies et réussit, après 18 ans de patience, à l'amener à la religion. Elle mourut le 14 juin 1674. Son mari la suivit sept semaines plus tard. Elle eut un seul fils, Roger du Plessis qui, servant comme volontaire pendant un siège, fut tué très jeune et lui laissa une petite fille, Jeanne Charlotte du Plessis. Elle l'a confiée d'abord aux éducatrices de Port-Royal, ce que le vicaire de Saint-Sulpice lui