son Introduction, Bernard Colombat procède à des comparaisons instructives avec d'autres traités comme ceux de Palsgrave (1530), Sylvius (1531), Meigret (1550), Estienne (1557) et Garnier (1558), ou, plus modestement, avec la tradition de la grammaire humaniste italienne (p. lxxvi). On trouvera également en annexe une comparaison entre les éditions de l'*Institutio* publiées à Paris (1561) et à Lyon (1586) ainsi qu'un tableau comparé des conjugaisons françaises au XVI^e siècle dans les ouvrages déjà cités auxquels s'ajoutent ceux de Du Wes (1532), Ramus (1562), Bosquet et Cauchie (1586).

On pourra regretter que, si la traduction française moderne indique la pagination correspondante de l'original, le texte latin, en revanche, ne comporte pas de renvois à la traduction. De même, dans l'Introduction, il n'est pas clair si les nombreuses citations renvoient au texte latin ou à sa traduction (par exemple, pages xvi et xxi). Les copieuses notes apportées à la traduction répètent souvent les propos tenus dans l'Introduction et l'on aurait pu réduire sensiblement la taille de l'ouvrage en évitant ces redondances. La bibliographie regroupe utilement les éditions de la grammaire de Pillot, les traités des grammairiens anciens et les études des linguistes modernes. À la fin de l'ouvrage, plusieurs index renvoient aux termes techniques latins et grecs du texte latin, aux matières linguistiques traitées par Pillot à partir de la traduction, aux mots français cités par Pillot dans ses exemples, aux noms d'auteurs et de personnages anciens et modernes, et enfin aux dialectes, langues, peuples, villes et régions tels qu'ils apparaissent dans la traduction. De tels outils permettront aux futurs chercheurs d'explorer plus avant la constitution de cet étonnant métalangage latin au milieu du XVI^e siècle dans un ouvrage qui contient sans doute peu de véritables innovations théoriques mais où se manifeste un réel souci d'efficacité pédagogique.

FRANÇOIS RIGOLOT, *Princeton University*

Jacqueline Cousin-Desjobert. *La théorie et la pratique d'un éducateur élisabéthain: Richard Mulcaster, c. 1531–1611*. Paris: Éditions SPM Lettrage Distribution, 2003. Pp. 520, including appendices (pp. 345–470).

No one would deny that Richard Mulcaster's "longévité exceptionnelle" (p. 24), his wide circle of notable acquaintances, and his involvement in a broad range of public issues as a headmaster (first of Merchant Taylors' School, then of St. Paul's) and educational theorist make his life a privileged point of entry into the "monde fascinant" (p. 20) of the English Renaissance. Jacqueline Cousin-Desjobert takes the reader on an extended tour of that world, shuttling back and forth between the key English texts of Mulcaster on pedagogy — *Positions* (1581) and *The Elementarie* (1582) — and their intellectual, political, and social contexts. The project is a promising one, and a wealth of detail is deployed, with the author's industry and enthusiasm for the task everywhere apparent. Particularly in delineating Mulcaster's diverse personal and professional relationships, which remarkably (for a man

who never left England) reached out to Continental Europe, the book makes a valuable supplement to its closest precursor, Richard L. DeMolen's *Richard Mulcaster (c.1531-1611) and Educational Reform in the Renaissance* (Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1991), to which it is naturally indebted. There would appear to be no accessible aspect of Mulcaster's life and work that Mme Cousin-Desjobert does not broach (even if her approach, which is hardly deconstructionist, allows for only passing mention [p. 243, n. 13] of Jonathan Goldberg's *Writing Matter: From the Hands of the English Renaissance* [Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990]). Finally, however, neither Mulcaster's texts nor their contexts are particularly well served.

It is hardly an uncommon experience to be reminded of a scholarly book's beginnings in a doctoral thesis. In this case, not only is the reminder pervasive and insistent, but it is also distinctly inflected by that thesis's origin within the French academic system (Université de Paris IV — Sorbonne, 1996). Apart from the sheer bulk, and the implicit claim to exhaustiveness that goes with it, the generic imperatives make themselves felt at every level of the organization — from the outline-style subdivisions to the frequent illustrations and extensive annexes (including photographic reproduction of the entire *Catechismus Paulinus* and *Cato Christianus*), the multiple bibliographies, and, finally, the triple index (of names, institutions, and themes — the latter strangely including "Animaux," then "Animaux mythiques"). The ensemble remains in the shadow of the *jury de soutenance*, to the point where the author specifies the libraries in France where various English sources are to be found. It is regrettable, given the potential of her substantial research to engage specialists world-wide, that Mme Cousin-Desjobert did not rework her thesis thoroughly before publication, orienting it frankly toward the international scholarly community (on the model, for instance, of Pierre Spriet's magisterial *Samuel Daniel [1563–1619]. Sa vie — son œuvre* [Paris: Didier, 1968]).

But even to take *La théorie et la pratique d'un éducateur élisabéthain* on its own terms is also, unfortunately, to be disappointed on a number of counts. It would be churlish to complain about getting convenient access to some of the more obscure texts assembled, but they are not always effectively introduced, and it is not clear why some of those in Latin are presented only in the original, others only in (French) translation, still others in both forms. A similar inconsistency applies to Mulcaster's English writings, of which the original is sometimes given, sometimes not, according to no apparent principle — a source of frustration for any serious reader, including French anglicists. Equally unexplained is the decision to use Robert Herbert Quick's nineteenth-century edition of *Positions* rather than the recent one by William Barker (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), although the latter figures in the list of works cited. That list, incidentally, unhelpfully mingles primary and secondary sources, while it is followed by an especially heterogeneous "Bibliographie complémentaire," whose rationale would presumably have been clearer if the asterisk following the heading had actually pointed the reader to the expected explanatory note.

These, however, are matters more of form than of substance. An ultimately more troublesome element is a less tangible one: the discrepancy between Mme Cousin-Desjobert's thorough acquaintance with Mulcaster, confirmed by a formidable array of references to the primary documents, and an unconvincing thinness when it comes to Elizabethan culture generally. The further she ranges from her central figure, the more she tends to rely on secondary material, some of it dated — Foster Watson on the English grammar schools (1908), William H. Woodward on Renaissance education (1906) — and the less solid her judgements appear. The effect is compounded by the construction of thematic subsections around Mulcastrian textual nuggets — often in an hourglass shape, as the discussion pans in, then out again.

This approach virtually precludes sustained analysis of Mulcaster's ideas through their discursive presentation (which is often very discursive indeed, and interestingly so); it also segments information and encourages repetition, of which there is a fair amount. Moreover, at the points of greatest distance from Mulcastrian facts and pronouncements, the allusive backdrop tends to harden into brittle decor. Thus, while Mulcaster's association with Claude de Sainliens, a pioneer in the teaching of French in England, is a substantial and pertinent matter, the suggestion that this "confrère français" might have supplied a "secours linguistique" (p. 92) to help Mulcaster read Montaigne is unhelpfully fanciful. Actively incongruous is the elevation of Mulcaster's praise of walking for exercise in the herb-scented country air to "un tableau idyllique que n'aurait pas renié l'Ophélie d'*Hamlet*" (p. 188) — a play that suffers further when Polonius' precepts are seemingly confused with Hamlet's use of his "tables" as an *aide-mémoire* (p. 245). And one senses a serious loss of scholarly bearings when Spenser, in evoking the victims wrecked on the Rock of Vile Reproach as they fly the Gulf of Greediness (*The Faerie Queene*, II.12.4), is said to have been praising "les intrépides marins de sa Majesté Élisabeth" (p. 257) — evidence, supposedly, of the impression made on him at Merchant Taylors' by Mulcaster's enthusiasm for English explorers.

The distortion in handling peripheral texts is often compounded by missed opportunities. To approach Mulcaster's relatively liberal ideas about educating women through *The Taming of the Shrew* seems more distracting than productive, and becomes positively misleading when we are told that Katherina in that comedy comes to repent her attempt to play the "femme savante" (p. 151); that has hardly been her game. On the other hand, something might well have been made of the play's representation of a father's attempt to socialize his daughter through home-tutoring — provided, moreover, by unqualified imposters. Likewise, there might have been real point to Mme Cousin-Desjobert's conclusion of this discussion with Heywood's *A Woman Killed with Kindness*, particularly its claim that Anne Frankford has received such an education "As might become the daughter of a prince" (cited p. 168). Given the inability of that education to preserve the character from moral ruin, might this illustrate the perils of educating women (and indeed men) beyond their station in life — another Mulcastrian theme? Undeveloped as it is, the allusion seems otiose.

Mme Cousin-Desjobert does not openly idealize Mulcaster, but her impulse to do so is palpable. As she invites her readers to rejoice when wholehearted approval is possible (“Aux amateurs de la musique, ceci risque de plaire; notre pédagogue est entièrement en sa faveur” [p. 199]), so she is made uneasy by his failures to meet modern standards of tolerance. Mulcaster’s willingness to beat children is countered, fairly enough, with his preference for gentle encouragement and rejection of cruelty. His enlightened views on the education of women are understandably welcomed. Yet, faced with his politically incorrect jest that girls’ chatter is more obtrusive than boys’ because girls have less in their heads, the author is so concerned to provide a cushioning context that she risks denying Renaissance women their due of shrewdness and irony — even Queen Elizabeth, who, we are told seriously, publicly “confessait” (p. 153) that her brain was too small to consider the question of the succession. By the end of the book, in any case, all the ruffles have been smoothed out, and Mulcaster emerges unequivocally as a champion of “la cause féminine” (p. 343).

Still more urgently, the militant anti-Catholicism expressed by Mulcaster at various moments must be countered by evidence not only that he was no narrow-minded Puritan, opposed to dancing and theatre (as is easily shown), but that, in effect, some of his best friends were Catholic. On this point, a very substantial opportunity is forfeited — namely, to explore the complex interrelations among education, religion and politics in Mulcaster’s time and place. Mme Cousin-Desjobert’s discussion at once intriguingly stakes out and frustratingly skirts this territory. There is, for instance, Mulcaster’s insistent eagerness to educate for the greater glory of the Protestant English state, not to mention his official involvement in the “re-education” of the two grand-sons of Sir Henry Jerningham (privy counsellor to Mary Tudor), who had been consigned to house arrest since their attempt to flee to the Continent. Then there is his indebtedness, on the one hand, to Vives (Mary Tudor’s tutor, after all, though not a notably orthodox Catholic) and, on the other, to Knox, whose precedence in advocating democratized primary education is somewhat belatedly acknowledged (p. 340). Finally, Mme Cousin-Desjobert regularly draws parallels between Mulcaster’s methods and those of the Jesuits — although her claim for the cultivation of “catharsis” in school-plays is a conspicuously weak link at both ends (p. 216) — and one would have liked to see her pursue the implications of his resemblance to those equally dedicated educators, who were nominally his mortal enemies.

The Jesuits were so anathematized, notably, in the fascinating poem that Mulcaster published both in its original Latin and in (rather free) English translation on the double occasion of Elizabeth’s death and James’s succession in 1603. This text, it must be said, is less fascinating for its literary quality — indeed, the English version comes as close to doggerel as unrhymed verse can do — than for its religious politics, which begin with Mulcaster’s authorship of it in the first place. One consequence of his longevity was his exceptional capacity to bear public witness to dynastic continuity, and the poem on the succession makes a sort of complementary book-end to his official account of Queen Elizabeth’s entry into

the city of London on 14 January 1559 (new style), a work duly attentive to the religious symbolism blazoning the new dawn of Protestantism. When Mulcaster turns from Elizabeth to James, his preoccupation is with the danger of knife-wielding Catholic assassins; this is the point, surely (as it was Marlowe's at the end of *The Massacre at Paris*), of his implicit recollection of Jacques Clément's stabbing of Henri III (whose emblem was the triple crown):

... That is [God's] will that gaue King *Iames* a triple Crowne:
A triple Crowne? What's that? a fatall terme, that is
The triple Brittiſh Crowne, the Romiſh bane. (fac. reprod., p. 364).

James will have to "auoid the Iesuites treacherous trames" and is memorably warned, "if thou stick'st to God, they'l not sticke to sticke thee."

Mme Cousin-Desjobert does more than miss this last point; she deflects it through mistranslation — "si tu adheres à Dieu, / Ils renonceront à te piquer de leur venin" (p. 332) — not realizing that "not sticke" in this instance means "not hesitate." (See OED "stick," II.15, citing Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*, II.ii.126: "They will not stick to say you envied him.") To be fair, DeMolen, whose commentary she footnotes, seems to have misconstrued the line similarly, but she might have noticed that he also mistranscribed the corresponding Latin (*op. cit.*, p. 148), turning "quia non vitaueris illos" — "since you will unavoidably have been exposed [to Jesuit plots]" — into the unintelligible "quia nos vitaueris illos." Moreover, her error is not an isolated one. Strained word-games in verse present a special challenge, but the author avowedly finds Mulcaster's prose difficult (p. 341), and one wishes that she had consulted someone who felt more at ease with it. The instances where she facilitates comparison by citing in both English and French reveal a number of doubtful renditions, occasionally with equally dramatic results. Thus we are informed that "'resolute minds make no bones' [*Positions*, ch. 41] traduit parfaitement l'état d'esprit réformateur de [l']auteur," but the French proverb offered as an equivalent, "Têtes obstinées ne font pas de vieux os," makes a less than perfect translation — to the point of meaning nearly the contrary (p. 256 and n. 44).

At the very core of her subject, then, as more often at the fringes, there are lapses in her mastery of the material that offer little incitement to trust in the author's analyses. Less significantly, but as a nagging reminder of hasty production and insufficient revision, the reader is likely to be distracted by the inordinate number of typographical errors and mechanical inconsistencies. Most of these are local instances of sloppy punctuation and typography (especially word-spacing), but they extend to conflicting policies on the printing of accents on capital letters (they appear on E but not A). Indeed, one can fairly tell the confused accents of this book by its cover, where the second é of "élisabéthain" is left uncovered; thereafter they become progressively more acute.

RICHARD HILLMAN, *Université de Tours — François-Rabelais*