

what I said, only because I have no idea what the “right” thing would have been, I do believe that speaking was better than not speaking.

I tell this story because it serves as a metaphor (as well as a model for Hoy’s own critical practice) for what Hoy accomplishes in this book. Hoy, a white critic, takes the risk of publishing a book of criticism on Native literature, of stepping into the fray of the complex politics of appropriation of voice, of privileged white academics publishing on books by authors who do not always themselves have easy access to publishing houses, of adding to the albeit fairly small number of books by white critics on Native writers, while the number of books by Native critics on Native writers (or other writers) remains, for reasons Hoy herself addresses, smaller still. It is a complex and sensitive critical space, but I’m glad that Hoy chose to speak, and her book provides the many and diverse people grappling with these issues with some good guidance for talking about literature in the rich and complex contexts of reader and author.

Gillian Siddall

Juliette Merritt. *Beyond Spectacle: Eliza Haywood’s Female Spectators*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2004. Pp. 154. \$45.00.

The number of texts exploring work by eighteenth-century women writers has grown exponentially since the early 1990s. ‘Scandalous’ authors such as Eliza Haywood have acquired respectable reputations denied them in their own historical moment as feminist scholarship investigates the consequences of women writing and publishing their work. Many now consider Haywood a subversive author who criticizes the societal constructs imposed upon women in her time, yet works within the confines of the social order that governed her publication, her livelihood, and her public persona. *Beyond Spectacle* situates itself solidly within this body of recent feminist scholarship on Haywood.

In her introduction, Juliette Merritt admirably summarizes recent Haywood scholarship. For the uninitiated, this introduction serves as a useful entry into important critical debates surrounding Haywood’s work. She includes a brief outline of several issues, including the public sphere of the literary marketplace, commercial aspects of publication, and women’s roles within these spaces. Haywood scholars might find this comprehensive background familiar, but the information proves useful as Merritt frames her own assertions. Rather than insisting upon a narrowly focused thesis, Merritt uses the

eighteenth-century woman and her relationship with the male gaze as an entry into an investigation of elements of eighteenth-century spectacle found in Haywood's fiction and their influence on women's daily reality. Merritt is interested in the "visual/linguistic nexus for its capacity to increase women's access to knowledge and power" (9), and Haywood's treatment of this nexus to establish agency. In an era when men gaze and control while women are gazed at and controlled, Haywood's appropriation of this spectacle reinscribes a level of power, and therefore agency, to female protagonists. The opening chapter analyses Haywood's first novel, *Love in Excess*, the amatory novel that made her famous. Merritt brings together ideas of female sexuality and visual desire and explores them in the framework of contemporary scientific discourse, which relied on rational, objective observation. She notes Haywood's rejection of such discourse as exclusively masculine in order to achieve political resistance for her female characters. In Haywood's fiction, women as well as men exhibit desire by directing their gaze in particular directions. Merritt's discussion focuses on the binaries of feminine/masculine, object/subject, spectacle/spectator and the moment of power resulting from the protagonist's ability to take advantage of the inherent instability of such categories and to move between the two realms.

The second chapter shifts to masquerade and the performance of the female gaze in Haywood's *Fantomina*. Immensely popular in the eighteenth century, masquerades were extravagant balls open to those who could afford the price of admission and an ornate costume. Liberated from everyday societal constraints by masks, those who attended masquerades practiced an otherwise unknown abandon in opulent surroundings. Underlying this seemingly harmless entertainment was the fear that such disguise would escape from the ballroom into everyday life for the purpose of deception, as occurs in Haywood's *Fantomina*. Throughout the text, *Fantomina* constantly changes her identity in order to pursue a fickle lover. Merritt argues that Haywood's use of masquerade is a literal use of costuming and mannerisms in order to shift the female character from a position of object to that of subject. The protagonist becomes the spectacle, but through a choice that accords her a measure of power over her own sexuality. Intertwined with this complex model of sexual identity are questions of class and social mobility. Merritt examines the complications that arise from the protagonist being a gentlewoman with the means to support a disguise that imitates women of lower classes. Paradoxically, disguise in this role and the successful appropriation of agency is available only to women with wealth, for to the poor, power over the self is nearly impossible. Conversely, Haywood's renders her male characters and their sexuality as objects, subjected to the critical gaze of Haywood's

female readers. Merritt then complicates the mere reversal of power relations by noting that Haywood “insisted on women’s moral superiority in sexual relations” (55). To seize control from men was not sufficient; women were expected to demonstrate an elevated moral character from their newfound, however temporary, position of power.

Merritt then extends her discussion to include Haywood’s female characters in *The British Recluse*, who are shaped by Restoration theatrical conventions. This argument, justified in part by the fact that Haywood herself was an actress on the stage, becomes more compelling with Merritt’s examination of the inextricable links between visibility and language. Much like actors on the stage, Haywood’s characters depend first upon the visual to create desire, but then upon language to exert control and establish their own feminine subjectivity. Merritt claims: “At the heart of the matter is the rhetorical power of language itself, a power that Haywood knew to be gendered and unequal” (77), a fascinating claim that she does not develop further. As this statement is fundamental to her argument, I would have appreciated a more extended discussion here.

The final chapter takes up feminist critique concerned with the amalgamation of author and text. Merritt contends that while the separation of such spheres proves useful in readings of modern texts, writers like Haywood must be read within their specific cultural context. It is inevitable that their work was influenced by the material difficulties of a female writer in the eighteenth century. Issues surrounding education for women, or lack thereof, and the relegation of women writers to inferior professional positions meant that Haywood struggled to earn both a living and a professional reputation throughout her forty-year career. Merritt juxtaposes these personal circumstances with Haywood’s employment of the spy figure in the both *The Invisible Spy* and *Bath Intrigues*. She interprets the spy as Haywood’s effort to distinguish between power and authority, and the spy’s subsequent potential for subversive measures as an individual in possession of power at the margins of society. Not only does the protagonist operate as a spy, commenting upon society from its periphery, so too does the author herself. By writing such fictions, Haywood appropriates the roles of both spy and spectator, commenting on her environment from her marginal position at the outer edges of London’s publishing world. Merritt also argues that Haywood’s spy figure makes eighteenth-century women readers ever more aware of their position as spectacle, by arming them with the ability to escape the object position. This observation holds true for Haywood as well, as she manipulates her ‘spectacular’ position on stage and in literary circles to ensure herself a degree of agency and independence.

In short, *Beyond Spectacle* is an insightful and thought-provoking addition to feminist scholarship on Haywood specifically, and on marginality more generally. Especially instructive is Merritt's reading of *Love in Excess*, a text published the same year as Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* and essential to our comprehension of texts about marginality and colonization. The difference between the two works is that Haywood's women are colonized in England within the societal structures they must navigate each day. Whether by rejecting masculinized scientific discourse and destabilizing common binaries, appropriating masquerade, inspecting the link between language and visibility, or allowing the spy a measure of power at the margins of society, Haywood's characters constantly undermine the patriarchal power structure that controls their lives. Merritt's work provides innovative ways to think about gender and class structures of eighteenth-century England and the ways in which those at the margins worked against them in subtle but important ways.

Sarah Skoronski

Cynthia Sugars, ed. *Home-Work: Postcolonialism, Pedagogy & Canadian Literature*. Reappraisals: Canadian Writers ser. 28. Ottawa: U of Ottawa P, 2004. pp 1, 530. \$39.95

The essays collected in *Home-Work: Postcolonialism, Pedagogy & Canadian Literature* engage some of the most interesting and important issues that currently circulate in Canadian literary studies. These include (but are not limited to) questions such as: is a nationalist approach to teaching literature still relevant in an increasingly globalized world? Is Canadian literature really a postcolonial literature, and if so, what does postcolonial theory have to contribute to the study and teaching of works produced in Canada both now and in the past? What use (if any) is a postcolonial approach to teaching various ethnic and First Nations literatures? How does one actually "do postcolonialism" in the Canadian literature classroom? And what are the relationships between an anti-racist and anti-elitist pedagogy in the literature classroom (which a postcolonial approach claims to foster) to other kinds of social and political work outside of it?

As Cynthia Sugars remarks in her very useful and comprehensive introduction, the struggles between colonialist loyalties and nationalist longings, and the tension between those same nationalist longings and the claims that various minority groups have made for recognition and respect, have shaped the institutionalized study of Canadian literature from its beginnings. Tracing