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“The reports of the Shepheards”) was changed to ‘Greenes Arcadia,’ presumably in an attempt to lift Greene to Sidney’s level of deceased eminence. By 1610 the phrase ‘Greenes Arcadia’ had become the book’s whole title” (69).

In the general editor’s preface to the series, Patrick Parrinder writes, “At a time when new technologies are challenging the dominance of the printed book and when the novel’s ‘great tradition’ is sometimes said to have foundered, [I] believe that the *Oxford History* will stand out as a record of the extraordinary adaptability and resilience of the novel in English” (xvi). The statement alludes to a famous instance of definition. At the sight of a sinking ship, amid cries of fear from his fellow shipmates, Robinson Crusoe admits, “It was my advantage in one respect, that I did not know what they meant by *founder*” (1719 ed., 12, my italics). By tracing the early beginnings of “the novel” within an age of “prose fiction,” Keymer and his authors make strides to place what is “the novel” within a larger, malleable framework of writing styles, one that can be adapted to the pressures of new media.

**Joshua J. McEvilla**
University of Toronto

**Lake, Peter.**
*How Shakespeare Put Politics on the Stage: Power and Succession in the History Plays.*

Peter Lake’s voluminous book about the political context of Shakespeare’s history plays is a product of reading a large body of Catholic texts and documents against some documents of the English Reformation. The book’s focus is a discussion of most of the “interesting and important” elements of the “politics and political culture of the 1590s” (xi). These elements include the nature of Englishness as it was represented and tested in this crucial decade: the achievement and instruments of operation during the Elizabethan regime. Study of the politics of the 1590s—as Lake demonstrates in impressive detail and with nuanced interpretation—involves an analysis of rebellion, bastardy, usurpation, Parliament, providence, predestination, clerical conspiracy, political tyranny
and animosity, hereditary claims to land and reign, sedition, “machiavellian
calculation” (33), rhetorical maneuverings of those in power and those who
demand it through force, competition for honour, and chronicle histories that
counter the court “secret histories” (32), as well as concise discussion of the
plays within the historical context of political events and currents. It also entails
reading “promiscuously across different styles and moments in literary criticism”
(xi), by which Lake means moving broadly through a vast period of literary
history on the subject, and citing from books that one generally no longer comes
across in footnotes and bibliographies. Yet this is what gives Lake’s historical
interpretation critical depth, breadth, and solidity. In bringing together a diverse
body of texts, Lake gives detailed summative and interpretative accounts of their
interrelatedness as makers of meaning.

The book’s subtitle captures the gist of what preoccupied the historical
and theatrical texts of the 1590s. Organizing a large body of this kind of
material is a complex task, but Lake succeeds in structuring the book in a way
that follows the established chronology of the writing of Shakespeare’s history
plays—most of which, before we come to Julius Caesar (1599), belong to the
early part of Shakespeare’s career.

The first sixty pages of the book are devoted to a methodological and
structural survey of the historical and epistemological background to the book’s
engagement with drama and theatre history, as well as covering the critical
literature on the plays themselves and on the theatrical milieu that produced
plays of Tudor succession in the late 1580s and into the 1590s.

Having shown how the historical past and their documents enabled the
staging of history in the present, Lake explores “the politics of lost legitimacy”
in parts 2 and 3 of Henry VI. Here, as throughout the book, Lake focuses on
the historical issue that both colours a specific text and provides the contextual
backbone of his narrative—without weighing his discussion with lengthy
quotations from the Catholic pamphlets in which the succession in England is
heavily debated.

The third part discusses part 1 of Henry III and its succession piece,
Richard III, and makes a fresh comparison of this play (and its dense rhetoric of
power) with the early Roman tragedy, Titus Andronicus. What connects these
three plays, and what Lake elaborates on in this section, is the replacement of
“ancient political virtue from civil to military affairs” (125) and the dramatic
debate about the “topos of noble faction” (125) in military conduct. Faction,
succession, and heroic virtue are explored in an engaging narrative about the
play in which history and literature are seamlessly discussed.

The fourth part centres on an analysis of two related plays, King John and
Richard II. Since the former play tends to be unjustly neglected in theatre and
criticism, the devotion of a long chapter to the interlocking of the historical
and theatrical reigns of the medieval King John is a welcome re-assessment of
the play in context. What I have found particularly helpful are Lake’s seamless
and persuasive connections between clusters of plays across chapters, so that
one sees the history play as an organic whole in the staging of politics—making
links in a sea of disparate events and texts—rather than as individual plays that
pick up on individual threads pulled by different factions in the political theatre
of the Elizabethan state. Lake’s incisive caption for the politics of the crusade
in 1 Henry 4 announced at the end of Richard II—“the politics of commodity”
(292)—and the explanation of how this purpose frames the politics on stage
in the former play demonstrate Lake’s cross-referencing of plays and the
interweaving of their major themes.

In the sixth part, Lake delves into the difficult and critically and historically
rewarding territory of uncovering the ways in which the plays were read and
interpreted when performed. The goal is to test the hypotheses presented in the
previous chapters. The focus is on the Falstaff/Oldcastle connection with the
names of Brook/Lord Cobham, rivals of the earl of Essex, who requested that
the name Sir John Oldcastle be changed on the grounds of their descendancy.
Lake’s detailed analysis is a most reliable account of this tangled issue.

Part 7 presents the Roman history Julius Caesar in relation to the staging
of republicanism in Elizabeth’s Christian monarchy. But it also shows in
detail how in this Roman play, as in Henry V, the “incapacity” (437) of others
undoes the “effort to transform” (437) a state, Roman or English, respectively.
Unsurprisingly, the topic of heroic honour is discussed in its many political and
historical manifestations, both on stage and in the political arena of the 1590s.
Lake finishes with a discussion of Hamlet and Troilus and Cressida, reveals the
English politics behind the performed Danish politics, and offers in contrast
a reading of Troilus and Cressida as “evoking and evaluating the political and
moral wreckage left by the debacle of the Essex rebellion” (534).

The conclusion ties together effectively all the main threads from the
book’s analyses, showing once again Lake’s interpretative skill in connecting
a myriad of historical fragments and loosely related stories of events, acts,
genders, and historical figures, in a distilled critical point about the historical basis of the plays. At this moment, when English history plays are experiencing a comeback in the theatre, Lake’s book will be of value to scholars, students, and the general reader seriously interested in Elizabethan history based on scrupulous research. We need such books to understand how these complex and brilliant plays gave Shakespeare a distinct dramatic identity in the crowded and competitive theatre scene of 1590s London.

GORAN STANIVUKOVIC
Saint Mary’s University, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Maira, Daniel.

Le romantisme français, comprenant la Restauration (1814–1830) et la Monarchie de Juillet (1830–1848), n’est pas seulement une période riche en développements nouveaux au sein de la production littéraire, mais connaît aussi une intensification exponentielle de la critique et de la théorie, que stimulent les débats politiques de ces années. L’instrumentalisation du passé qui se fait dans ce contexte a été maintes fois étudiée, en premier lieu celle du Moyen Âge. Il est donc étonnant de voir l’absence presque totale de travaux consacrés à la représentation romantique de la Renaissance, alors que, dans les œuvres littéraires de la période romantique, cette époque est tout aussi présente que le Moyen Âge et se prête tout aussi bien à la récupération politique. Daniel Maira est le premier à entreprendre de présenter dans son ensemble l’image romantique de la Renaissance.

Maira examine de nombreux textes littéraires (d’auteurs connus comme de minores) et leur paratexte, ainsi que des textes théoriques sur la littérature. S’y ajoutent quelques ouvrages historiques généraux ainsi que des cours professés par des personnages comme Ozanam, Michelet ou Quinet. Son approche relève essentiellement de la sociocritique, non sans intégrer des éléments des queer studies, mais vise toujours à établir un rapport avec la situation politique et les opinions des différents partis, ce qui se justifie pleinement dans ces années 1814–1848.