

translation. The reader will more profitably turn, instead, to Ricci's 1965 text (Volume V of the *Edizione Nazionale*) and/or Prue Shaw's excellent 1995 Cambridge translation. On p. 135 a footnote indicates that the *Middle English Dictionary's* publication is ongoing, while it was in fact completed in 2001. It is unclear to me why, on p. 173, an obvious typographical error in Coopland's translation of Philippe de Mézières' *Letter to Richard II* is printed with 'sic' instead of simply being emended (silently or otherwise). The rather tremulous and inelegant letter-form the printers used for 'yogh' irritated greatly. I am unsure why Lacan is listed as a 'Primary Source' and Žižek as 'Secondary Source' in the bibliography.

K. P. CLARKE *University College, Oxford*

doi:10.1093/res/hgm055

*Advance Access published on 14 June 2007*

NICHOLAS WATSON and JACQUELINE JENKINS (edd.). **The Writings of Julian of Norwich: A Vision Showed to a Devout Woman and a Revelation of Love.** Pp. xii+474. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2006. Cloth, \$65.

'As an interpretive, hybrid edition whose editors have sought out the most lucid readings from the available manuscripts and used principles of internal coherence and rhetorical balance as evidence, this edition becomes part of the interpretive tradition of Julian's writings' (p. 42). Watson and Jenkins' edition of Julian's *A Vision Showed to a Devout Woman* and *A Revelation of Love* is a most useful addition to Julian scholarship; nevertheless its editorial methodology will trigger debate that may threaten the degree and usefulness of the whole. The book certainly highlights Julian of Norwich's composition process and the relationship between the texts attributed to her. The page layout of *A Revelation* with corresponding passages of *A Vision* at the bottom, together with the facing side notes, makes it useful for anyone wanting to understand the complexity of the argument offered by the texts. In that respect this edition fills a gap in Julian scholarship; its persuasive, user-friendly design will also attract an audience not yet familiar with Julian's writings and will thus introduce a new generation of students to Julian studies. However, the text's hybrid nature raises questions, some of which this review will address.

The interpretive mode not only shapes the structural form of the edition but also—perhaps in imitation of Staley's own division of Margery Kempe's persona into two distinct literary roles—serves to define two of Julian of Norwich's divergent roles, that of *participant* in *A Vision*, and that of *interpreter* in *A Revelation*. The editorial strategy of this edition is dictated by the desire for an enhanced understanding of the role of interpreter endorsed by Julian in *A Revelation*.

Even if the edition does not use the normal methodology of a 'critical' edition, which chooses to reproduce a text from the manuscript deemed to be closest to the archetype or its holograph, it nevertheless aims synthetically to reconstruct a text in which Julian's authorial and interpretive intention can be accessed. The ideal text of *A Revelation* that this edition claims to produce is made by adding together information and readings from all the available manuscript sources. The most consistent manuscript presence in their edition is, however, that of MS Amherst; as it is sole witness to *A Vision* it is, of necessity, markedly present in the first part of the book. That presence is also clear in *A Revelation*, however. Indeed, 80% of *A Vision* appears verbatim in the synthetic edition of *A Revelation*. So, even if *A Vision* represents only a small portion (25%) of the text of *A Revelation*, it is the central cog of this editorial project, as the relationship between the different manuscripts most often works in favour of the Amherst manuscript (A)—a version which,

according to the editors, is a 'good', textually independent manuscript. As import for the making of this textual project equals that of Paris, MS Bibliothèque Nationale Fonds anglais 40 (hereafter P), chosen as base manuscript for the edition of *A Revelation*, against London, MS British Library Sloane 2499 (hereafter S). Indeed, scholarly contributions in the 1980s and 1990s seem to have favoured S (and Glasscoe's edition of *A Revelation* in 1976) for its ability to reveal the theological and literary complexity of Julian's prose, and its debt to the process of oral composition, which played a significant role in the making of *A Revelation*. The choice of P, which Colledge and Walsh used for their own edition of *A Revelation* (1978), is made by Watson and Jenkins on the following grounds: its readings are endorsed by A, and also from the extracts of Julian found in London, Westminster Archdiocesan Archives (W); P offers a fuller text than S; the logic of its argument is clearer; its rhetorical figures more balanced (pp. 37–8). The choice for P, against S, despite detailed argument (pp. 35–40), will not go unquestioned by Julian scholars.

I would have liked to read a longer discussion on the language of the Paris manuscript. The editors argue that P's language is a translation from a northern East Anglian dialect into fifteenth-century East Midlands Standard English, rather than a translation into seventeenth-century English. Claim is therefore made that P is only a dialectal translation; and since A and S both preserve dialectal forms located in or near Norwich, and are assimilable to Julian's own dialect, some words in P are retranslated into the dialect as preserved in S. The additional principles of emendation clearly detailed in the introduction (pp. 40–3) confirm the high degree of hybridity of this edition, with its movement backward in time to lexical forms, which were in use in Julian's own northern East Anglian dialect, and its converse movement forward—the spelling and orthography of both *A Vision* and *A Revelation* are in modern English spelling (pp. 43–9).

The daring editorial procedure that informs this edition of *The Writings of Julian of Norwich* will not remain unchallenged, as its editors—who announce this edition as part of a larger interpretive project on Julian's writings—well know. It is, however, surprising that the editors do not make room in their argument to acknowledge that some of the extant manuscripts use just the kind of interpretive interference principle that they do. What if, for instance, P was the product of several writers each of whom was lured by the interpretive potential of *A Revelation*? That would render P a partial testimony to the 'dynamic' textual tradition of *A Revelation*, to which this edition also contributes.

DENIS RENEVEY *Université de Lausanne, Switzerland*

doi:10.1093/res/hgm063

*Advance Access published on 30 July 2007*

KATHERINE ROMACK and JAMES FITZMAURICE (edd.). **Cavendish and Shakespeare, Interconnections**. Pp. 217. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006. £45.

Margaret Cavendish was an early beneficiary of the feminist recirculation of women's texts. Anne Shaver's edition of Cavendish's selected plays and Anna Battigelli's intellectual biography of her both appeared in 1999, and the stream of Cavendish studies has shown no sign of abating since then. But the breadth and distinctiveness of Cavendish's *oeuvre*, and her royalist politics, have long presented challenges that the works of the Countess of Pembroke and Lady Mary Wroth do not. Yet it is because of Cavendish's breadth and internal variety—she was biographer, scientist, poet, dramatist, author of speculative fiction—that she is particularly well-suited for a narrow-focussed edited collection. *Cavendish and Shakespeare: Interconnections* uses the helpful critical strategy of working on one area of Cavendish's encyclopaedic accomplishment at a time.