décrire les bâtiments dans leurs contrats et écrits. Serlio fut, selon Jelmini, un des premiers écrivains à créer de nouveaux termes architecturaux en italien en les adaptant du latin. En outre, dans le Livre VI sur l'architecture domestique en France, Serlio créa de nouveaux mots italiens en les adaptant du français. La mention des recherches de Jelmini aurait soutenu le parallèle établi par Pauwels entre l'architecture et la littérature, puisque les poètes de la Pléiade avaient le même besoin de créer de nouveaux mots⁵.

Finalement, il y a des différences entre l'attitude de Thomas Sébillet, Joachim Du Bellay, et Pierre de Ronsard sur les moyens pour transformer la poésie française. Ce sujet n'est pas abordé dans le livre de Pauwels, mais je conseille le lecteur de lire l'analyse excellente de Laura Willett dans l'introduction à sa traduction de la *Deffence et illustration de la langue francoyse* et d'autres textes de Sébillet et de Ronsard⁶.

MYRA NAN ROSENFELD, *Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, Victoria College, University of Toronto*

Jane Milling and Peter Thomson, ed. *The Cambridge History of British Theatre, Volume 1: Origins to 1660*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Pp. xxix, 540.

Co-editor Jane Milling's article on "The Development of a Professional Theatre, 1540–1660" begins by reminding us that "The writing of a theatre history reveals almost as much about contemporary tastes and values as it does about the cultural world of the past. Historians tend to organize their material into familiar explanatory or narrative structures." The point is true of this volume. While the title suggests a comprehensive exploration of British theatre up to 1660, the section headings—"Pre-Elizabethan Theatre ... Elizabethan Theatre ... Jacobean and Caroline Theatre"—reveal a bias towards the Early Modern period in which Milling and Peter Thomson specialize. David Bevington has pointed out that calling medieval drama "pre-Elizabethan" labels it as a literary curiosity, more important as a forerunner than in its own right. Other aspects of the critical apparatus reinforce this sense of second-class citizenry: the timeline which usefully accompanies the volume starts at 1540, despite the first article's lengthy survey of Roman and medieval theatre. The latter two sections of the volume provide essays on standardized topics—theatre and controversy, a case study, and a socio-theatrical snapshot of a single year—but only the snapshot approach appears in Section One. Finally, while the volume lacks a formal

5. Alberto Jelmini, *Sebastiano Serlio, il trattato di architettura* (Université de Fribourg, thèse de doctorat, 1975), Fribourg, 1986.

6. Laura Willett, "Introduction", *Poetry and Language in 16th- Century France: Du Bellay. Ronsard. Sébillet* (Toronto : Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, 2004), pp. 1–33.

introduction (an unfortunate omission, since it would have provided the editors with an opportunity to defend and contextualize their choices), Milling's article frequently serves a similar purpose by referencing the other articles which follow hers, yet her essay is the fifth in the volume and the first in the second section. Overall, editorial choices give the impression that the first section was tacked on as an afterthought.

The section titles are in fact imprecise. Milling's article ranges from 1540 to 1660, and yet begins the section on Elizabethan theatre (1558–1603). Similarly, the first article of the Jacobean and Caroline section, Roslyn Knutson's excellent introduction to the often collaborative writing process of early modern playwrights, considers writers from 1580–1642, starting two decades before the period to which her article is assigned. One of the best articles in the Pre-Elizabethan section is Paul Whitfield White's "The Bible as Play in Reformation England" which argues controversially for an increase in religious drama until 1580, a date well within the Elizabethan period. It might have been more helpful to distinguish the numerous articles which consider religious and political contexts and controversies (Whitfield White, Happé, Greenfield, Henderson, Gurr, Dillon, Dutton, Butler, Clare), on the one hand, and those more concerned with patrons, plays, and performances (Westfall, Cave, White, Lindley, Thomson) and with economic aspects of the London theatre scene (Milling, Bruster, Knutson), on the other. While these categories would not cover all of the articles (Coldewey's and McGavin's more general surveys, for instance), they would go a long way to indicating the volume's strengths.

As well as being unhelpfully structured, the volume is quite narrowly focused. While there are excellent essays considering theatrical activity outside the London professional theatres, particularly Suzanne Westfall's article on the impact of noble households and David Lindley's discussion of Stuart masques, the volume generally emphasizes a conception of theatre that privileges formal theatrical settings and professional performers. The medievalists in the volume are more prepared to challenge generic distinctions, as with John J. McGavin's broadly defined concept of play in "Faith, Pastime, Performance and Drama in Scotland to 1603" and Peter Happé's consideration of "paradramatic activities" in the snapshot article "Drama in 1553: Continuity and Change." The later sections, however, focus on professional stages and their participants. Folk drama (mummings, Robin Hood plays) is mentioned briefly but is not considered in its own right, and, beyond references to the cycle plays, there is little consideration of theatrical activity in civic contexts outside London.

Despite the word "British" in the title of the book, its geographical scope is similarly narrow: McGavin's article addresses Scottish drama to 1603, but there are no articles on later Scottish theatre and, despite two brief references to James Shirley's time in Dublin, no discussion of Irish theatre. Even within discussions of London's professional stage, production elements of costume and music are rarely addressed. While the preface asserts that the volume "makes no pretence to all-inclusiveness," these gaps are problematic.

Editorial choices apart, the nineteen articles in this collection are generally very good in themselves. Several articles expressly provide new contexts, provoke questions, and, as Richard Dutton states in his case study of the political controversy around *A Game at Chess*, “make room for individual readers to engage in the debate.” Many of them reflect a shift in scholarship towards context and performance, as opposed to an emphasis on printed plays. Martin White’s discussion of “London Professional Playhouses and Performances” offers a practical survey of archaeological and archival evidence which pairs up well with Lindley’s discussion of “The Stuart Masque and its Makers.” Richard Allen Cave’s case study of Jonson’s *Every Man in His Humour* and Thomson’s article on “Clowns, Fools and Knaves” both consider changing genres in professional performances throughout the period. Martin Butler’s snapshot of theatre in 1642 and Janet Clare’s article on “Theatre and Commonwealth” both provide a nuanced understanding of theatre’s continued presence during the civil wars and the inter-regnum, demonstrating how careful archival research and a broader understanding of context can reveal ephemeral performances.

The broader surveys, though, tend towards oversimplification. For example, John C. Coldewey’s “From Roman to Renaissance in Drama and Theatre” must cover a lot of ground in 67 pages, and so tends to re-inscribe theories of theatrical evolution and suppression that recent scholarship has come to question. He hints that these issues are more complex, but he does not have the space to explore them, and this may leave students trailing behind current debates. Likewise, the treatment of Coventry’s Hock Tuesday Play in Happé’s survey of drama in and around 1553 underplays the distinctiveness which is brought out in the treatment of this play in the Coventry REED volume.

Overall, there is much to admire in this collection, but it is not altogether satisfactory as a whole: the title does suggest a scope and an authoritativeness which are not realized in the finished book.

SHEILA CHRISTIE, *University of Alberta*