porter sur toutes les forces répressives ». Autant dire qu'il a encore un bel avenir ! Ce volume manifeste aussi l'intérêt de l'auteur pour la « civilisation du paraître » : belle formule, et qui ne contredit pas son éthique de la sincérité. D'où ces articles sur les Entrées des princes, ou l'évolution du costume à la Renaissance. Le monde, en effet, est un théâtre, mais un théâtre qui peut permettre l'émergence de la vérité.

Au-delà des thèmes, c'est un certain ton qui assure l'unité du volume. Un ton libre, voire impertinent. Avec beaucoup de sûreté, Madeleine Lazard a su trouver des sujets où elle peut donner libre cours à sa volonté de savoir et faire connaître des figures oubliées, comme ces « Deux sœurs ennemies, Marie Dentièrre et Jeanne de Jussie », l'une ancienne religieuse, l'autre fidèle à l'ordre des clarisses au moment de l'établissement de la Réforme à Genève. Mais elle connaît trop bien l'histoire pour laisser croire que la Réforme a été favorable à l'émancipation de la femme.

Un mot vient naturellement sous la plume quand on a lu ou relu ces articles : le brio. Quel que soit l'auteur, quel que soit le sujet, c'est le même allant, la même vivacité, le plaisir de découvrir et de faire découvrir. Souhaitons qu'il ait beaucoup de lecteurs.

DANIEL MÉNAGER, *Université de Paris X – Nanterre*

Helen Ostovich, Mary V. Silcox and Graham Roebuck, eds. *Other Voices, Other Views: Expanding the Canon in English Renaissance Studies*. Newark: University of Delaware Press; London: Associated University Presses, 1999. Pp. 324.

The editors of this volume of thirteen essays present it as an “amplif[ication]” of, rather than an “assault on,” the early modern canon, which is broadly referred to in passing as “Shakespeare, Jonson, Spenser, and Donne.” The contributors bravely champion the “literary potential” of texts that “have been considered inferior and inappropriate for serious study” (p. 7). In many cases, their arguments for including these works on early modern syllabi are persuasive, yet they also frequently apologize for the literary quality of the works under discussion and argue instead for their larger cultural significance. When they occur, these apologies — which contradict the volume’s larger project as just stated — nevertheless foreground interesting questions of whether the criteria with which we have assigned literary value are the criteria the early modern period would have used. The editors describe “the whole volume as a series of historically specific readings of social relationships, understood from the point of view of marginalized or neglected sources” (p. 9). The essays “do not share a unified theoretical bias” and have “no common agenda based specifically on issues of class, gender, and race” (*ibid.*). Their collective aim is to increase our awareness of and engagement with the “cultural bustle” (p. 10) of the early modern period.

The delightful phrase, “cultural bustle,” applies not just to the multivocal/multifocal (the heading for one section of the book) discourses proliferating in the

period, but also to the criteria by which authorization and canonicity are established in the early modern period and in our own. In the canon debates of the past two decades or so, one point of departure that often seems to go unrecognized is the acknowledgement that we are faced with an embarrassment of riches, a profusion of texts that, collectively, are inexhaustible in their intertextualities and broader cultural resonances. Inasmuch as the hard work of choosing must be done, such a predicament would seem to be, rather, something to celebrate. The work of recovery undertaken by, for example, feminist and New Historicist scholars has served to make the necessity of choosing for the purposes of research and teaching even more pressing, but we are richer for it. Nevertheless, the challenge, if fundamentally a practical one, quickly becomes colored by politics. As the editors point out in their introduction, “present-day hyper-awareness of what is at stake in the college and university curriculum, in combination with newly articulated concerns and politics . . . has almost simultaneously created a canon and destroyed it” (p. 8).

David Linton’s essay on “Reading the Metacanoncal Texts” begins the collection. Taking one step further back in the process of canon formation, Linton suggests we might usefully identify four major categories of metatexts, or those documents which serve to determine the “entry conditions” (p. 22) for canonical works: governmental, media, promotional and analytical metatexts. For example, he defines governmental metatexts as “all official, legally binding instruments whose purpose is to shape and control what gets read, who reads, under what circumstances reading and writing are carried out, and what is considered worth reading” (p. 22). Linton attends to the subtle changes in the wording of the final 1563 Council of Trent decrees concerning reading and publishing, and the 1566 and 1586 Star Chamber decrees regarding printing, arguing that they reveal the awareness authorities had, by 1586, that in a print culture, as opposed to a scribal culture, they needed to control not just the content of documents but the means by which that content was produced — the printing press: “This is a remarkable moment in the history of communications for it marks an official awareness of the idea that ‘the medium is the message’” (p. 24). Linton urges the inclusion of these metatexts in more mainstream university syllabi to augment and complicate student understandings of the period, and he also suggests that whole courses might be devoted to a wide range of metatexts in order to better understand “the organic socio-political forces at play” (p. 42) in culture formation.

While no seismic shifting of the canon is intended by or likely to result from the discussion of these texts, as a group, the essays in *Other Voices, Other Views* at the very least present a refreshing lens through which to view the usual suspects. We read about minor works by well-known authors, such as George Herbert’s neo-Latin poem, “Aethiopissa ambit Cestum” (c. 1620), in an essay by Anthony Martin, who adds a new dimension to recent discussions by Heather Dubrow, Kim Hall, and Michael Schoenfeldt. Martin focuses on the intertextualities of Herbert’s poem and suggests that Herbert’s ventriloquizing of the black woman’s voice stands “on the edge of the movement in ideology of Africans from the exotic/erotic to

the subjugated and despised,” and is the only instance when we hear an African woman speaking “from at least a limited position of personal freedom” (p. 266) in Renaissance poetry. Also exploring a major author’s “minor” works, Philip Collington points to the relative neglect of Thomas Middleton’s earlier dramas in recent discussions of the “emblematic,” and demonstrates the importance of a more precise analysis of what constitutes the emblematic in a dramatic scene.

Works by less-known authors, such as Anne Locke’s “Meditation” on Psalm 51, are “justified” on more than one front in a pair of essays by Kel Morin-Parsons and John Ottenhoff. Locke amplifies the penitential psalm by writing a sonnet based on each verse (two verses receive two sonnets each), for a total of twenty-one sonnets. While both Morin-Parsons and Ottenhoff apologize for the literary quality of Locke’s work, they argue that it must take its place in the early modern canon for several reasons. First, the “Meditation” predates Sidney’s *Astrophil and Stella* by two decades and is therefore the first sonnet sequence in English; our understanding of both the development of the sonnet tradition and the devotional lyric needs to be adjusted accordingly, as does our tendency to segregate sacred and secular texts, even though their formal elements would encourage us to consider them in light of one another. Secondly, written by a woman, the “Meditation” is an important text in helping us to understand the ways in which women could participate in the public sphere via literary endeavors, even as their prescribed role was to be “chaste, silent and obedient.” Thirdly, its dismissal as “feeble and uninteresting” (Ottenhoff, p. 290) is perhaps a function of our own way of assigning literary value and means that it has been judged on terms different (and perhaps irrelevant) to those of its production.

As with Anne Locke, the often-represented historical figure, Jane Shore, figures in two essays in the volume, which again makes for interesting intertextual “conversation” in close quarters. Stanley McKenzie examines the ambiguous position Mistress Shore occupies in Michael Drayton’s *England’s Heroicall Epistles*. McKenzie convincingly argues that Drayton’s Shore outsmarts both king and husband by cleverly manipulating a trope of sovereignty. Drayton then contains the subversive voice of Jane, using an overt authorial voice that purportedly guides the reader in a correct moral appraisal of Jane’s disruption of patriarchal class and gender structures. Yet McKenzie suggests that Drayton may have made this authorial voice “as ‘churlish’ as Mistress Shore describes her husband” as being, so as to foreground “the confining forces against which Mistress Shore rebels,” to help “legitimize her transformation,” and to subvert “the authorial voice’s attempts at enclosure” (p. 228).

Jean Howard uses Thomas Heywood’s immensely popular *Edward IV* to take issue with some of Richard Helgerson’s arguments in his influential 1992 *Forms of Nationhood*: his tendency to homogenize the “other” dramatists, all of whom, Helgerson suggests, were writing a different kind of history from that which Shakespeare was writing in his plays; his dichotomizing of the social classes so that a “monarchic-aristocratic bloc” is positioned in opposition to a too-homogeneous “commons.” If Shakespeare’s contemporaries were writing about earlier

historical periods, Howard argues that signs are abundant they were writing in a period when the “commons” were really comprised of smaller groups busy distinguishing themselves from each other. Moreover, in Heywood’s *Edward IV*, “national history is *domesticated*. . . . If Shakespearean history is obsessed with genealogy and the legitimacy of ruling dynasties, but cares very little about families in anything like a modern sense, Heywood reverses the emphasis” (p. 141; Howard’s emphasis). The tragedy of Edward, Jane, and Matthew Shore is portrayed as a domestic, rather than, or in addition to, a royal one. Howard goes on to argue that “[i]f the history genre is a site of social struggle over who will be written into narratives of the nation, it is the burgher class who gets top billing in Heywood’s world” (p. 145). Heywood’s Jane Shore is the center of “a complicated ideological scenario”:

On the one hand, in criminalizing Jane he deflects blame from Edward and also makes it clear that women’s autonomous sexual agency must be regulated, if not by a husband or father, then by the state. . . . On the other hand, in making Jane the attractive affective center of the play, Heywood also makes her the embodiment of citizen values. (p. 148)

In the rest of the volume, the early modern texts focused upon vary widely in terms of genre and (therefore?) degree of “marginality.” Judith Deitch makes a case for attending to a neglected “anti-genre,” the English dialogue, of which more than 300 examples have been catalogued but which has remained largely excluded from discussions of the period. In one of several essays which focus on the interplay between the visual and the verbal in the early modern period, John H. Astington examines the cultural performance involved in documenting — in a series of engraved prints — another cultural performance: the annual Lord Mayor’s Show in London. Astington argues, like many of the other authors in this collection, that understanding a particular cultural moment does not always mean that the texts associated with that moment will manifest much intrinsic artistic merit, but maintains that the texts he discusses are important in that they evidence “the growing cultural sophistication of London, demonstrating a native practice of printmaking, a native market, and native subjects” (p. 87).

Together, the essays of *Other Voices, Other Views* urge us to re-examine or at least to approach with an open mind those marginalized texts which were in some cases more centrally positioned amidst their own “cultural bustle.” While there is, at times, perhaps not enough confidence on the part of the essayists when asserting the importance of these texts, the impulse driving the volume is a healthy one. Scholars and students alike will find useful discussions of both the texts themselves and the ways in which the shaping of the canon by means of “metatexts” has influenced our understanding of the early modern period.

H. L. MEAKIN, *Case Western Reserve University*