stimulante toute l'histoire théâtrale de l'âge dit « classique » par le panorama même qu'au détour de sa démonstration elle en offre, et fournit sans doute la meilleure conclusion, ouverte aux travaux placés dans cette perspective, de l'ensemble de l'ouvrage.

Par la richesse et la variété des domaines abordés et des perspectives adoptées, ces deux volumes offrent donc un ensemble extrêmement utile qui est loin de s'adresser seulement aux spécialistes ou amateurs de théâtre. Tout leur intérêt consiste justement à montrer que le point de vue du spectacle permet une réévaluation générale de l'ensemble des formes d'expression culturelle.

NATHALIE DAUVOIS, *Université de Toulouse II—Le Mirail*

Mary E. Burke, Jane Donawerth, Linda L. Dove, and Karen Nelson, eds. *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Culture in Tudor and Stuart Britain*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000. Pp. xxx, 306.

This collection seeks to challenge the still widely accepted notion that women were at the margins of early modern culture by instead positing women as producers of culture. Taking their cue from cultural studies, the editors in their introductory remarks outline the complex relationship which women had with early modern culture. The dominant culture may have constructed and oppressed “woman,” yet, in requiring women’s identification with its constructs, it actually depended on women’s participation in the creation of culture. This dependence opened the door for women’s negotiation with culture, for their resistance, and also, of course, for their reproduction of the very structures which oppressed them.

Despite the complex model of women’s relationship to culture posited in the introduction, however, most of the contributors to *Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Culture* concentrate on the more positive constructions of women’s relationship with culture — namely, negotiation and resistance — and shy away from women’s contribution to their own apparent silencing and marginalization. This is perhaps unsurprising for a collection which, despite its alignments with the poststructuralist assumptions of cultural studies, assumptions which necessarily problematize women’s heroic agency, is still ultimately about recuperation.

Some of the first essays in the collection show women using and reworking the materials of their culture. Jane Donawerth demonstrates that some Tudor women — her examples are Anne Lok, Isabella Whitney, and Mary Sidney — conceived the creation, presentation, and circulation of texts in terms of the system of gift exchange in which women were already active participants, presenting embroidery or medicaments, for instance, as a way to cement social relationships. Georgianna Ziegler’s thoroughly researched essay on Esther Inglis, a woman of Huguenot family living in Scotland, shows how her manuscript “gift books” transformed and personalized already printed works of devotion for her various

Protestant patrons, giving Inglis at the same time a certain degree of “authority” (as Ziegler puts it) over the texts she was reproducing by virtue of the skill, the ornamentation, and the self-portraits she added to them.

Essays by Margaret P. Hannay and Kathi Vosevich focus on elite women’s reproduction of the terms of class privilege and difference. Hannay convincingly shows how Mary Sidney’s sense of her aristocratic identity and privilege influenced her translations of the Psalms (although Hannay wisely concedes that some of what Sidney was emphasizing — for instance, that the great have a responsibility to the poor — was already present in the Hebrew originals). Vosevich’s somewhat deterministic argument links the regnal styles of Mary I and Elizabeth I to their respective “tutors”: Jan Luis Vives (at least through *De Institutione Feminae Christianae*, which he wrote for Mary Tudor) taught Mary to subordinate and silence herself, but Roger Ascham taught his more “successful” royal pupil Elizabeth the oratorical skills by which she could assert herself as a “prince” or a “king.” Mary E. Burke’s essay on the sonnets attributed to Mary, Queen of Scots, also considers the conflicting imperatives which a female monarch faced — obey as a woman, rule as a prince — and sees this conflict reproduced and perhaps “balanced” by the sonnet-speaker’s wrestling with an adulterous passion for an inferior. The fascination with British queens continues in Carole Levin’s essay on Elizabeth I’s possible appropriation of two popular virgin saints of the Middle Ages: St. Uncumber and St. Frideswide. It is a commonplace that Elizabeth I took over elements of the Catholic cult of the Virgin Mary in the construction of her own “cult” of the Virgin Queen. Levin speculates that Elizabeth may have similarly appropriated the bearded St. Uncumber’s resistance to marriage and St. Frideswide’s healing powers.

One of the most intelligently argued essays of the collection is Mary Ellen Lamb’s analysis of patronage in Aemilia Lanyer’s *Salve Deus Rex Judaeorum*. Lamb’s essay challenges the already substantial body of criticism on Lanyer’s work, which typically sees her addresses to female patrons as a protofeminist gesture, a textual and social building of women’s community. Lamb, however, demonstrates Lanyer’s conflicted relationship to patronage: she is at once painfully dependent on her patrons and also critical of the class system which elevates them above her for reasons of birth rather than merit. Lamb, moreover, connects Lanyer’s confusion to a crisis in the institution of patronage itself: writing, like other forms of labour, was caught between feudal models of recompense, based on service, loyalty, and affection, and more capitalistic models, whereby the alienated products of labour could be bought and sold according to the rules of self-interest. Lamb’s essay is perhaps more pessimistic than most in this collection about the extent of the early modern woman writer’s ability to resist or recast the social and cultural formations which limited her.

Despite the volume’s consciously up-to-date methodology and announced allegiance to cultural studies, the majority of the contributors to this volume (all women) still clearly want to find “foremothers”: other professionalized, writing women who “succeed,” especially at feminist critique. In their discussion of

pseudonymous women's texts, Ilona Bell and Barbara McManus both make the useful point that determining the "true" identity or gender of an author is perhaps not as important as recognizing the possibilities that the new subject position of speaking *as* a woman in defense of women opened (for instance, making connections between women across class). Bell, however, in her discussion of the 1567 *Letter Sent by the Maydens of London*, still expends a lot of energy arguing for the plausibility of female authorship. Esther S. Cope's essay shows an interest in the prophet Eleanor Davies' "professionalism," an interest which, suggestively, was carried on by her daughter Lucy, Countess of Huntingdon, who corresponded with historians about their portrayal of her mother's activities. Most pronounced, however, is a consensual interest in "resistance." For Marilyn Luecke, writing on Elizabeth Clinton's *Countesse of Lincolnes Nurserie*, the aristocratic mother's decision to eschew the fashionable wet-nurse and breast-feed herself presents an opportunity for resistance in the exercise of conscience. It also allows for a "new" integrated construction of motherhood, which reconnects the breast with the reproductive body and allows for the extension of mothers' nurturing (and authority) over their children beyond the womb and into adulthood.

A resistant reproduction of culture, of course, provides the clearest example of heroic, innovative intervention by women of the past. Criticizing or counselling a monarch is another surefire way of claiming influence at the "centre." Linda L. Dove reads Mary Wroth's sonnet sequence "Pamphilia to Amphilanthus" as a critique of James I's patriarchal absolutism, constructing a complex analogical chain which links the "Love" or Cupid of the sequence with an initially tyrannical, subsequently co-operative king who learns from the household politics of the speaker of the sequence (Pamphilia, also equated with Queen "Reason" and Wroth herself) to rule more as a companionate husband than as a tyrant father. Karen Nelson reads *The History of the Life, Reign, and Death of Edward II* as Elizabeth Cary's "maternal" advice to a neophyte Queen Henrietta Maria in 1626–27. According to Nelson, the historical Queen Isabel's acquisition of power through the son she had borne and through her ability to dissemble is presented as exemplary to the still childless and unemollient Henrietta Maria.

The clearest case for a woman's attempt at political intervention through writing is made by Elaine Beilin in her essay on Anne Dowriche's long narrative poem, *The French Historie*. Beilin demonstrates that Dowriche's familial connections involved her with the "nonconformist" critics of Elizabeth I's religious policies in the 1570s and 1580s and persuasively argues that her versified account of the French Parlement's resistance to Henri II's persecution of Huguenots reproduces the concerns and even some of the language of dissident English Members of Parliament — particularly their objections to Elizabeth's attempts to limit debate on the further reformation of the English Church.

This collection is a real contribution to the study of early modern women writers and will be of use to critics and scholars of literature, history, and culture. Its contributors present less-studied figures, like Esther Inglis and Anne Dowriche, and make revisionary arguments about others, like Aemilia Lanyer, who have

already made it into a new canon of women writers. It opens further possibilities for studying early modern women writers by modelling a profitable alliance with cultural studies. Still, the volume has by no means exhausted the avenues by which we ought to approach the study of “Women, Writing, and the Reproduction of Culture.” Are there cases, we also may ask, of women’s writing which is not resistant in our terms, but which nonetheless acted centrally to reproduce early modern culture(s)? Tudor and Stuart Britain clearly did not see the liberation of women. To what extent did women, and women’s texts, reproduce the culture which kept this from happening?

SYLVIA BROWN, *University of Alberta*

Ian Frederick Moulton. *Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Pp. xiii, 268.

In these days of rising costs, falling currencies, and vanishing book-buying budgets, *Before Pornography: Erotic Writing in Early Modern England* stands out as deserving to be purchased by and for a wide spectrum of readers. Drawing on years of extensive reading (much of it in dusty manuscript archives), Ian Moulton explores — in fluid, well-polished prose — the representation and circulation of erotic desires and sexual acts from roughly the early sixteenth to the late seventeenth centuries. Among its many valuable features, this book is especially noteworthy for its side-by-side consideration of hetero- and homoerotic discourses, as well as its investigation of selected European authors and texts (in particular, Aretino).

For readers who might not be overly familiar with the last decade or so of early modern gender and sexuality studies, *Before Pornography*’s introductory chapter sets the theoretical stage and gracefully establishes the main glossary of terms. Dealing with much-discussed issues such as the development of privacy and the implications of bodily humours, Moulton positions his study as a contribution to the ongoing investigation of the ways in which early modern erotic writing was an arena for the negotiation and contestation of gender, the family, and national identity. In this section, Moulton also clarifies his position that erotic writing is any text that deals with human sexual activity; love, importantly, is neither necessary nor even, as the rest of the book shows, all that common.

Moulton also uses his introduction to explain his use of the term “pornography.” While he has a solid grasp of the problems surrounding historical anachronism and the need for historical specificity, I confess that, by the end of this discussion, I didn’t fully comprehend why the term — which really appears quite seldom in the rest of the volume — was necessary. While Moulton says that many scholars equate early modern erotic representation with pornography, I’m just not convinced that’s been the case (at least since about the mid-1980s).