Si, pour M^{me} de Liancourt, le but de l'éducation des femmes n'est pas leur enrichissement intellectuel, elle ne néglige pourtant pas ce problème. Les enfants que l'on ne destine pas à l'Église, mais qu'on élève pour le monde, doivent être instruits dans les langues et dans les sciences conformément à leur capacité. Cependant, il faut leur faire "comprendre de bonne heure la dignité de leur condition de chrestiens."

Il faut avoir le même soin de l'éducation des garçons que des filles, mais auprès de celles-ci il convient de placer des femmes. La Duchesse de Liancourt désapprouve donc l'éducation mixte. Des remarques concernant l'éducation des filles restent cependant encore actuelles: "Il n'est pas besoin qu'elles ayent des grâces affectées pour attirer les yeux," ou encore "ne les laissez point accoutumer à parler brusquement, ni même à parler haut devant vous en compagnie, ou devant d'autres personnes de grand respect, si ce n'est en répondant." Ce chapitre mériterait une place dans toute anthologie des écrits destinés aux jeunes filles dans la France du dix-septième siècle.

En nous rappelant ce livre utile, Colette H. Winn a donc un mérite incontestable. "Il n'y a que la vertu qui demeure": cette idée semble récapituler le mieux les principes de M^{me} de Liancourt, ceux qu'elle voulait inculquer à sa jeune lectrice.

KAZIMIERZ KUPISZ, *Université de Lodz*

Viviana Comensoli & Paul Stevens, eds. *Discontinuities: New Essays on Renaissance Literature and Criticism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998. Pp. xx, 244.

The title of this collection is misleading in two ways. For one thing, the focus throughout is on criticism rather than literature: some essays hardly mention literature at all and the others tend to treat literature as the prop for arguments about criticism. Also, despite the editors' emphasis on discontinuity, the collection is in some important ways remarkably continuous with earlier work. That is, the discussions on literature concentrate on Shakespeare (and to a lesser extent, on other dramatists) and on literature from around 1600. There is almost no discussion of poetry apart from Nate Johnson's interesting account of Donne's eight elegy and its place in the Donne canon. Prose fiction is not represented. The first two writers do deal with work outside the standard Renaissance canon: in her attack on postmodernism, Sylvia Brown deals very briefly with mother's legacy books and in what is probably the best written essay in the book, Katherine Osler Acheson analyzes some of the self-representations of Lady Anne Clifford.

Discontinuities is a good title in some ways. As the editors promise, the various writers often disagree with each other. Furthermore, almost all of them disagree

with Stephen Greenblatt — an example of *concordia discors*. For instance, Tracey Sedinger takes issue with Greenblatt as a way to plead for the usefulness of psychoanalytic criticism and Linda Woodbridge takes issue with him and several others in order to caution us against an uncritical reliance on social history. Greenblatt seems to be about to replace E. M. W. Tillyard in the Oedipal drama which is such a feature of Renaissance literary studies. In this connection, one of the most interesting and entertaining essays is Barry Taylor's analysis of the difference between American new historicism and English cultural materialism, in which he debunks many of the English critics' favourite pretensions. Perhaps Greenblatt can still be saved, although Taylor's essay is admittedly less of a defence of Greenblatt than an attack on what is often presented as the grand tradition of English marxism.

Some of the writers confront the emphasis on Shakespeare. Elizabeth Hanson eloquently argues in general terms against the reduction of Renaissance literature to Shakespeare and says that changes in critical thinking have "not seriously challenged the overwhelming centrality of Shakespeare" (p. 75). In fact, they have helped it: more theory = more Shakespeare. Susan Zimmerman provides a specific version of Hanson's argument in a discussion of the importance of horror to Renaissance theatre. She accurately points out that our concentration on Shakespeare has prevented us from seeing the extent to which the representation of horror was a crucial feature of many Renaissance tragedies.

Karen Newman argues for Shakespeare. Her theory is that as literature is increasingly replaced by "mass cultural forms" the persistence of Shakespeare "allows the contemporary critic working in the early modern period to be read" (p. 100). This is the old and politically disreputable strategy of presenting a dominant group (Shakespeareans in relation to the rest of us) as itself oppressed by another more powerful group. Still, Newman's analysis of *Timon of Athens* (for Shakespeareans, a positively *recherché* text) is one of the best pieces of literary analysis in the book, even if it is not particularly well connected to the rest of the essay.

Timon of Athens is also the main literary example chosen by Sharon O'Dair in her deeply satisfying discussion of how American academics talk about issues of class in Shakespeare and in society as a whole. She begins by juxtaposing Iago and Old Adam. Iago is a representative of the new social order in which service is merely paid labour, while Old Adam sees his service as part of his loyalty to his masters in what is very nearly a feudal relationship. From this, O'Dair goes on to discuss the standard accounts of class: Marx, Weber, and, to a lesser extent, Elias. Here she unfortunately reproduces the standard sociological shibboleth about the difference between Marx's and Weber's views of class, but her account is accurate for the most part. O'Dair then uses these concepts of class to discuss *Timon of Athens*. She makes the valuable point that although the money economy condemned in the play may be distasteful to us, the old style elite represented by Timon should not be a model

to us either. We should be subtle and independent enough as thinkers to condemn what Shakespeare condemns without sharing his conservatism.

O'Dair then moves on to a general discussion of the increasingly routine condemnations of capitalism made by professors. She points out that anti-capitalism in the academy is often linked to anti-populism and declares that "the profession's anti-capitalism is consistent with our self-interest" (p. 217). A good example of this, although one not cited by O'Dair, is that many professors find no trouble in reconciling their professed anti-capitalism with their willingness to exploit the increasingly large number of poorly paid and poorly treated sessionals.

Discontinuities ends with an afterword which is not a summary of the preceding arguments but rather the beginning of a new argument. Marta Straznicky makes a plea for continuity. In part, she wants to try to bring schools of criticism together, but her main aim is to bring research and teaching together. The sudden appearance of pedagogical concerns should make us realize how rare it is to find references to teaching in works of critical theory. Straznicky makes the specific point that teaching is not covered in the other essays and the general point that in theoretical sophistication our teaching tends to lag behind our research. Implicitly or explicitly, too many of us still teach our students the critical theories we were taught. Straznicky's point is well-taken, as the essays in this collection will not help us to transform our teaching. Nevertheless, they are, for the most part, interesting and persuasive and those of us who specialize in the English Renaissance will find them useful.

STEPHEN GUY-BRAY, *University of British Columbia*

La légende dorée. Édition critique dans la révision de 1476 par Jean Batallier, d'après la traduction de Jean de Vignay (1333–1348) de la Legenda aurea, texte établi par Brenda Dunn-Lardeau. Paris, Champion, 1997. Pp. vii, 1563.

Brenda Dunn-Lardeau est connue depuis longtemps pour ses travaux sur la *Légende dorée* de Jacques de Voragine. On se souvient du colloque international "*Legenda aurea: texte latin et branches vernaculaires*" qu'elle a organisé à l'Université du Québec à Montréal en 1983 et de la publication des actes qui en a conservé des traces substantielles (*Legenda aurea: sept siècles de diffusion*, 1986). Voici que l'auteure vient d'offrir à la communauté des chercheurs une pièce maîtresse du dossier: l'édition critique de la traduction française de Jean de Vignay, qui a connu une grande diffusion aux quatorzième et quinzième siècles, révisée à la fin du quinzième siècle selon les méthodes et les goûts pré-humanistes par Jean Batallier. La première impression, en abordant cet imposant volume, est celle d'un travail de grande envergure, impression qui n'est pas démentie à l'examen plus attentif de l'édition.