caractères typographiques et des bandeaux. Chaque section, consacrée à un discours particulier, est précédée d'une brève introduction situant L'oeuvre dans le contexte historique des années où elle a paru. Les notices bibliographiques, quant à elles, font état des caractéristiques matérielles de l'exemplaire examiné, de L'endroit où il est conservé ainsi que des particularités typographiques et orthographiques dont il fait preuve. De plus, afin de permettre au lecteur de se rendre compte par lui-même de certaines des différences et ressemblances qu'il souligne, L'auteur inclut dans chaque notice des facsimilé de la page titre, du privilège et des première et dernière pages du texte lui-même. La présentation soignée de ce livre ainsi que la nature même des recherches qui y sont présentées en font un ouvrage de référence, un catalogue très utile pour les bibliophiles s'intéressant à Ronsard.

Joachim Du Bellay. *Oeuvres poétiques*, Vol. VII (Oeuvres latines: *Poemata*). Texte présenté, établi, traduit et annoté par Geenviève Demerson. Paris: Librairie Nizet, 1984. Pp. 347.

Depuis leur parution originelle en 1558, les *Poemata* de Joachim Du Bellay n'ont connu qu'une seule édition complète, celle de Courbet en 1919. C'est pour rendre accessibles ces textes dans un format qui offrirait commentaires et traduction française que G. Demerson a fait paraître chez Nizet le volume VII des oeuvres poétiques de Du Bellay, livre qui sera suivi d'un second volume consacré aux autres écrits latins du poète. Dans son travail critique, Demerson suit L'édition de Morel (1558), la seule qu'ait connu au XVI^e siècle L'ouvrage dans son ensemble; elle signale toutefois les variantes en ce qui concerne les textes qui ont connu à l'époque plusieurs livraisons (en pièces séparées). Comme L'annonce le titre, chaque poème des quatre recueils formant les *Poemata* (soit les *Elegiae*, *Epigrammata*, *Amores* et *Tumuli*) est présenté dans sa version latine d'origine, côte à côte avec la traduction en français moderne qu'en a fait Demerson et suivi d'un commentaire qui, d'une part, replace le texte dans son contexte historique et, de l'autre, indique, sur le plan de L'intertextualité, quels sont les rapprochements possibles entre la pièce de Du Bellay et certaines sources d'inspiration. Les trois dimensions complémentaires de cette édition en font L'ouvrage le plus complet consacré aux poèmes latins de Du Bellay, lesquels constituent une portion assez peu étudiée quoique fort intéressante de la production de l'écrivain.

JEAN-PHILIPPE BEAULIEU, *Université d'Ottawa*

Play-Texts in Old Spelling: Papers from the Glendon Conference, ed. G.B. Shand. New York: AMS Press, 1984. Pp. ix, 162. \$29.50.

The papers gathered here report the proceedings of a conference held at Glendon College of York University (Toronto) in 1978. Given the many changes in editorial theory and practice, eight years is a long time, and many of the issues raised in the pages of this volume are not as burning today as they seem to have been then.

The title would lead one to expect the papers to revolve around whether readers should or should not have old-spelling texts, and, if they should, how should those texts best be presented. There is more of the latter than the former in this book, as well as a good deal of other material along the way. The editor good-naturedly introduces the volume, stating that the "conferees amiably agreed to disagree" (p.7). The opening paper by S. Schoenbaum ("Old-Spelling Editions: The State of the Art") and the closing one by John Stallworthy ("Old-Spelling Editions: The State of the Business") are congenial, general, and not very helpful. Paul Werstine's essay on the printing and the printer (William White) of *Love's Labour Lost*, demonstrating "The Usefulness of Printing House and Compositor Studies" is, like Werstine's other work, excellent, though it does not directly address the issues of old-spelling texts. I liked S.P. Zitner's piece on "Excessive Annotation, or Piling Pelion on Parnassus." Taking a page from the New Arden *Othello* (page 108, to be precise), Zitner shows how nearly all the commentary could have been removed or drastically curtailed. David Bevington urges "Editorial Indications of State Business in Old-Spelling Editions," but how much is enough, how much is too much, and how much is just right? One calls to mind some of John Dover Wilson's more exuberant volumes in the New Cambridge Shakespeare, not to mention Goldilocks's dilemma with the bears's porridge and beds. Better, I think, too little than too much.

On the last day of the conference, Philip Edwards, co-editor of the Clarendon *Massinger*, broke the congeniality of such conferences (see David Lodge, *Small World*) and declared, "If it were to do again, I would never do an old-spelling Massinger. I would never do an old-spelling edition. . . . I lost my faith." Good for him. Two essays in the volume support Edwards' lost faith. The first, Robert Kean Turner's short "Accidental Evils," discusses the problems inherent in calling the accidentals of a selected copytext "accidental" and the dangers inherent in treating them that way. If the accidentals represent the "texture of a text," then they can hardly be accidental, though few would regard them as substantive. Writing under his own name, Randall McLeod discusses kerns and ligatures in typesetting, and the spellings, pronunciations, and scansiones that result from such typographical necessities. Clearly the most telling essay in the volume, it left me "Spellbound" as it called into question the integrity of old-spelling texts even as it impugned spelling as evidence for studies of compositors and authorship.

I am not sure how far the craft of editing, the technology of publication, and the science of photography have come since this conference. Far enough, I hope, for my "ideal" edition to achieve scholarly and economic reality. My "ideal" scholarly edition features a photofacsimile of the copy-text on the verso of an opening, with its corresponding modern-spelling text, along with notes and commentary, on the recto. If the copy-text is in such bad condition that it cannot be reproduced photographically, then a diplomatic reprint (a loaded term) of the copy-text should be produced (Henry D. Janzen discussed just such a reprint in "Preparing a Diplomatic Edition of Heywood's *The Escapes of Jupiter*" in this volume). For the general public (and, really, excepting Shakespeare, what kind of general public is there for Tudor, Stuart, and Caroline drama?), there would be only

the modernized version (with notes and commentary), set from the same computer that generated the photo-ready copy for the scholarly edition.

We've come a long way, baby, but we've got a long way to go.

THOMAS L. BERGER, *St. Lawrence University*

Michael D. Bristol. *Carnival and Theatre: Plebeian Culture and the Structure of Authority in Renaissance England*. New York and London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1985. Pp.237. \$25.00

The study brings a valuable perspective to the debate on the origins of early modern theatre. The primary influence on early modern theatre, argues Bristol, is not "literary production and consumption" (p.4), but plebeian festive traditions as they are expressed in Carnival. An annual winter festival culminating in Shrove Tuesday (Mardi Gras), Carnival combines masquerades in the shape of "travesty and misrepresentation, stylized conflict and agonistic misrule" (p.53) with utopian fantasies of material wellbeing and social harmony. As a festive form of social cohesion, Carnival resists the arbitrary domination of secular authority, celebrating instead the common people's desire to preserve a collective authority which sets its own social standards. The spirit of Carnival, whose locus is the marketplace and public square, is absorbed by the Elizabethan and Jacobean popular theatre, a complex social, political, and literary institution representing to both its opponents and supporters "a genuine rupture in the fabric of social authority" (p.110).

In locating the source of early modern theatre in the Carnavalesque resistance to authority and the celebration of clowning, misrule, and summary justice, the study challenges the reconciliatory notion of history originally proposed by E.M.W. Tillyard (1948) and refined by Norman Rabkin (1967), both of whom view the Elizabethan theatre as intrinsically "reassuring and harmonious" (p.12). The study also goes beyond recent revisionist critiques of the 'essentialist humanism' underlying traditional literary criticism. The reductive orientation of these revisionist strategies, both structuralist and Marxist, results from a neglect of "peripheral interferences" (p.18) in the institution of theatre. The omission has led to a tenuous investiture of the divided self with "an historically specific psychology in the form of anxious self-fashioning" [as in Stephen Greenblatt's *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From More to Shakespeare* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1980)], and with "an historically specific social character in the form of radical subversion" [as in Jonathan Dollimore's *Radical Tragedy: Religion, Ideology and Power in the Drama of Shakespeare and his Contemporaries* (Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press, 1984)] (p.19). Bristol's analysis of the inter-relation between subjectivity, authority, and productive life draws upon a number of materialist traditions, foremost of which is Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of cultural heterogeneity which defines "struggle and difference" (p.18) as the governing principle of dialectical historicism. Developing Bakhtin's cursory analysis, formulated in *Rabelais and His World* (1968), of Carnival's primary function in Elizabethan drama, Bristol considers "the unselfconscious, ritual character of Carnival" as a vehicle for sustaining