

more irregular in this book is the curious absence of Ursula Appelt's co-editor, Barbara Smith, who did not even co-author the introduction. Especially in light of the expense of the book, prospective readers should look for other works by the contributors. Their editors did not serve them well.

Lady Mary Wroth. *The Second Part of The Countess of Montgomery's Urania*. Ed. Josephine A. Roberts; Completed by Suzanne Gossett and Janel Mueller. Tempe: Renaissance English Text Society in conjunction with Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1999. xlv + 575 pp. + 13 illus. \$60.00. Review by KATE GARTNER FROST, THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN.

This edition, a memorial tribute to Josephine Roberts, under whose editorship Part One appeared in 1995, has achieved a double distinction as a model both for editorial practice and for scholars in the field of women's studies. Beginning as consultants on the Part I project, Suzanne Gossett and Janel Mueller found that their discussions of editorial procedure were to bear fruit when, on Roberts's untimely death in 1996, they took over the incomplete editing of Part Two of Lady Mary Wroth's *Urania*, heretofore found only in a Newberry Library holograph manuscript. The enterprise was daunting: after constructing a system for references to the text that would smoothly incorporate the scattered preliminaries of Roberts's work, they had to provide critical and textual introductions, textual notes and annotations, and indices of characters and places, with Roberts's computer disks and file folders as their only guides. Not the least among these tasks was dealing coherently with her transcription and the Newberry folios themselves.

Their answer was to maintain Roberts's practice of modernized punctuation and paragraphing for rhetorical passages and to base final editorial decisions on her transcription of the manuscript. This done, the edition was coordinated with Part One (which had been published by Louisiana State University Press in 1995) and Robert's commentary-in-progress, supplying missing annota-

tions where possible from her extant files. Finally, they were able to preserve her conventions for analyzing Wroth's compositional process.

If the editors pay tribute to Roberts as a "model of scholarly graciousness" (xiii), they at the same time demonstrate graciousness of another kind, for Part Two demonstrates a praiseworthy subordination of their own scholarly and critical bents. Part of this can be ascribed to a reverent use of Roberts's material, which, as they admit, they left largely intact. Having become, in effect, her alter-ego, Gossett and Mueller have achieved her goal: Parts One and Two of the *Urania* form a nearly seamless whole. This is no mean feat since, for example, in preparing the textual introduction literally from the ground up they faced an entirely new set of problems (as their meticulous and exhaustive textual notes demonstrate) as the *Urania* moved from the Part One printed copy text to the holograph of Part Two.

If there is room for quibble, it is with aspects of the commentary. While one might have hoped for annotations sometimes less tendentious (although their aim is to leave the commentary for future "robust interpretative" scholarship (xiii), some annotations step over the line of scholarly information into the realm of modish interpretation) and for no anachronisms (for example, the 1776 State Seal of Virginia is cited as critically relevant to iconography practiced in the early seventeenth century), in the end there are few slips between cup and lip here, and the whole is helpfully cross-referenced with the Part One commentary.

A good edition gives one more than one wishes to know—depending, of course, on what one wishes to know. So here: we learn that Part Two is slightly more than two-thirds the length of Part One, its narrative focus moves to the second generation of that Part's characters, that the manuscript was likely begun in late 1621, that its emphasis on illegitimate children may reflect the ending of Wroth's connection with Sir William Herbert (amply documented in Part One), that the manuscript's provenance from its likely inception at Baynard's Castle until its purchase by the Newberry in 1936 is open to scholarly inquiry, that the bifolio concerning

Ampilanthus's (read Herbert's) fling with the lascivious Queen of Candia has been removed mysteriously, and that the hand throughout is Lady Mary's own very difficult one writing in her then-fashionable interplay of trailing and balancing syntax. Interestingly, the manuscript breaks off in midsentence and is peppered with blanks presumably to be filled in later with poems and names. In view of this, the editors attempt to forecast the convoluted marital and dynastic affairs of the second generation of characters is perhaps overly hopeful. Space is better spent pointing out the book's geopolitical scope. Part Two reflects a sophisticated understanding of the conflict between Europe and the Ottomans, manifesting a Christian Imperialism congruent with James I's vision of a New Holy Roman Empire. This orientation, however, does not obviate the autobiographical "shadowing" described by Roberts in Part One, opening the text, although not reductively, to inquiry regarding the ultimate disposal of Wroth's loyalties in the light of her children's rejection by their father.

Particularly interesting are the inserted illustrations of the author's handwriting and of maps which underwrite the geopolitical scope of Part Two, especially in its connection with the journeys of St. Paul (a significance ignored in the commentary, which provides a mere two scriptural annotations). Genealogies are followed by indices of characters, places, and first lines of poems.

If Professor Roberts is honored by this edition, more so is Lady Mary Wroth, one of the first English women who clearly saw herself as a writer by vocation: hers is the first published work of prose fiction in English by a woman and the first extended fictional portrait in English of a woman by a woman. *Urania*, questioning the pastoral romance's male heroic ideal, created new boundaries for political and social satire where women could become heroes outside the standards of masculine aggressiveness and where the creative life of a woman is on a par with that of the Petrarchan poet/lover/convertite. Josephine Roberts's intention was that her edition of *Urania* "meet scholarly standards and yet [be] accessible and inviting to modern readers" (xl). This

goal has been amply achieved in its completion by Professors Gossett and Mueller.

Jo Wallwork and Paul Salzman, eds. *Women Writing: 1550-1750*. Victoria: Meridian, 2001. 251 pp. \$20.00. Review by MIRIAM TASHMA-BAUM, THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY.

Women Writing: 1550-1750 is a collection of sixteen essays, earlier versions of which were given as presentations at a conference on early modern women's writing held at La Trobe University in Melbourne in July, 1999. The volume is a special book issue of *Meridian*, the La Trobe University English Review, 18.1 (2001). Following an introduction by Paul Salzman are essays by Elaine Hobby, Susan Wiseman, Julie Sanders, Lloyd Davies, Rosalind Smith, Sheila T. Cavanagh, Andrew McRae, Patricia Pender, Kim Walker, Mona Narain, Kate Lilley, Sophie Tomlinson, Jo Wallwork, Diana Barnes, Heather Kerr, and Patrick Spedding. Ten of the contributors are Australian, both academics and postgraduate students, and one of the purposes of the book is to showcase the significant amount of work being done on early modern women by Australians. The essays indeed display a variety of approaches to this fast-growing field, however despite its seemingly wide-ranging title, the collection is confined to essays on English writers and one American writer—Anne Bradstreet—writing of England.

The opening essay by Elaine Hobby interestingly analyzes attitudes towards the male and female body in Jane Sharp's *The Midwives Book* (1671), a modern edition of which was recently produced by Hobby, arguing that the empirical data found in such texts puts in doubt theories of the early modern body based on Foucault and Lacan. Hobby also argues for the need for further recovery of lost works by seventeenth-century writers "regardless of the gender of [their] author," for only through "an integration of work on male and female texts" can the latter be fully understood (20-1). Another article questioning traditional views is Patrick Spedding's "Eliza Haywood, Writing (and) Pornography in 1742"