

Syrith Pugh. *Herrick, Fanshawe and the Politics of Intertextuality: Classical Literature and Seventeenth-Century Royalism*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010. v + 196 pp. + 1 appendix. \$99.95. Review by CHRISTOPHER MADSON, UNIVERSITY AT BUFFALO.

Earl Miner's influential work, *The Cavalier Mode from Jonson to Cotton* (1971), renewed scholarly interest in royalist and High Church poetry from the late 1640s and 1650s, while simultaneously establishing the themes defining that genre—a retreat from politics and public life, a celebration of private sociability and inward virtue. Miner's work argues that cavalier thinkers responded to Charles's impending loss of the throne by removing themselves from public debate, quietly secluding to the countryside as they waited out a long political winter. Largely influenced by this work, the generation of critics following Miner too often trivialized or overlooked the political complexities underlying wartime and post-war royalist poetics. While new historicists have made significant efforts in the past thirty years to reestablish the political weight of cavalier poetry, there is much yet to be done in the field. And it is with this gap in mind that Syrith Pugh wrote *Herrick, Fanshawe and the Politics of Intertextuality*.

In her new monograph, Pugh complicates readings of Cavalier poetry, reinforcing the importance of approaching the works through their classical references. Specifically, she argues that Robert Herrick's *Hesperides* and Richard Fanshawe's translation of Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*, supplemented with other translations and original verse and prose, underlie their works with Ovidian and mythological references in such a way that those allusions collectively tell a story separate from the narrative of the individual poems. What emerges is a royalist poetic defined by its nuanced critique of the king's reign and the emerging republic. The intertextual references structuring these collected works Charles's—both published in 1648, just months before Charles's execution—allowed their authors to voice their politics without putting themselves too directly in harm's way.

Though Herrick's poetry is a staple in contemporary anthologies, Pugh argues that relatively little has been said about his politics, in no small part because he did not directly participate in the wars. This

is far from true. As Pugh notes, Herrick was ejected from his vicarage for refusing the Solemn League and Covenant in 1647, returning to London and publishing his ample collected works not a year later. For Herrick, these experiences cemented his loyalty to the king's brand of monarchy.

In her smart readings of Herrick's poems, Pugh shows how the poet incorporated the form and content of classical poetry—specifically drawing from Ovid—in order to create meaning that is systematic, complex and strategic. As Pugh notes, “Herrick's entire poetic output, excepting the religious verse of *Noble Numbers*, systematically alludes to all of Ovid's major poems too. This ... direct[s] the reader's attention not only to Ovid's individual works but to the whole shape of his career, whose narrative, reflecting his relation to political power, is fundamental to Herrick's purpose” (39). Despite Herrick's light and amatory subject matter, the network of classical references infusing the collection allows Herrick to communicate serious and large ideas.

Perhaps, the most interesting aspect of this Ovidianism is Herrick's appreciation and use of the concept developed in Ovid's exile elegies of poetry as virtual space, affording freedom from the limitations imposed in actual space and time by separation, exile and death (76). Modeled on the double space of Ovid's exile poetry, *Hesperides* on one hand represents Herrick's Devonshire living as a lamented ‘banishment into the loathed west’, his pseudo exile creating a discontent that reflected his bitter opposition to Cromwell's Parliament and royalist support, and on the other poetry itself, as a virtual space in which the defeated royalist party may survive fragmentation and defeat and continue to commune (57).

Pugh argues that Herrick's poems deployed Ovidian ideas both to critique the Parliamentary regime and lament its dominance. The intertextual qualities of his writing created a space in which the poet and his displaced king could enjoy an authority independent of and immune to hostile power (82).

Though few of us today know Fanshawe's poetry, his ideas and works were certainly respected by royalists in the 1640s. He was Secretary for War to the Prince of Wales throughout much of the civil wars. In this position, he orchestrated Prince Charles safe escape

from England in 1646, “making possible the restoration of monarchy fourteen years later” (87). Despite putting his life at risk to defend the king’s cause, and ensuring the continuation of the Stuart monarchy, Fanshawe’s collected works argue a polemic critical of Charles—a complex argument veiled in a network of classical references, a strategy similar to Herrick’s.

One of the most startling works in Fanshawe’s volume, according to Pugh, is his *Maius Lucanizans*, a commendatory poem first included in Thomas May’s *Supplementum Lucani* in 1640—an anti-Caesarean work that supports the death of a tyrant, specifically if that project calms civil tensions. Fanshawe’s poem weaves together references and allusions to Virgil, Lucan, Augustus and May’s work (155). In the end, our poet asks the young Prince to seek a Virgilian praise, one that “can be justified only when applied to a ruler who does not seek power for its own sake but only to serve the common good” (170).

As with her chapters on Herrick, Pugh interprets Fanshawe’s individual poems with a careful eye, revealing exciting layers of political meaning. In the end, Pugh shows that Fanshawe is doing more than just calling on “Prince Charles to return to a better style of government, submitting to the ‘counsel’ of those qualified by learning and wisdom—perhaps to govern in the ‘Parliamentary way’ of Queen Elizabeth.” Fanshawe’s collection “was also a call to the learned...to assume a more Spenserian role, devoting themselves to their country’s good by daring to offer moral and political guidance and admonition to their Prince” (149). Pugh’s analysis reveals a complex man. Fanshawe is a soldier critical of his king; a royalist who continues to support the idea of monarchy despite the fact that it has made him an exile in his own country.

In contrasting Herrick and Fanshawe, Pugh argues against Miner’s earlier work by documenting cavalier voices that do not retreat from the public forum. She reveals a post-war world where defiant royalists critiqued king and Parliament through skillfully crafted poetics. The subgenre of poetry that emerges utilizes intertextuality and allusion in ways that allowed Herrick and Fanshawe to articulate uniquely personal critiques of England’s political climate.

*Herrick, Fanshawe and the Politics of Intertextuality* will serve as a valuable resource to teachers of Herrick’s poetry and the history of the

English Civil Wars. More than that, Pugh also makes a compelling case for pulling Fanshawe more fully onto the literary stage. After reading this work, I would not be surprised to find excerpts of Fanshawe's translations or the poem "Two Copies of Verses to the Prince upon severall occasions" in future anthologies. His inclusion would allow us to paint a fuller picture of the civil war experience.

Rahul Sapra. *The Limits of Orientalism: Seventeenth-Century Representations of India*. Newark:: University of Delaware Press, 2011. iv + 219 pp. \$65.00. Review by NAGENDRA RAO, GOA UNIVERSITY.

Edward Said's *magnum opus*, *Orientalism*, has influenced a considerable number of scholars, who have used Saidian doctrine to critique pre-modern societies of the East with an arsenal of broad generalizations. Colonial authors denigrated Indian culture as barbaric and uncivilized and produced a simplistic, dichotomy between East and West. This approach has placed all colonial scholars in one homogenous category and by implication all Indians in another. The aim of *The Limits of Orientalism: Seventeenth-Century Representations of India* is to show that a simplistic interpretation of eastern culture and civilization is unwarranted and undesirable, since it produces faulty readings of "colonial" texts. Some scholars have been sympathetic, consciously or unconsciously, to the native culture, which is not in itself homogenous but rather variegated. The argument that colonial authors perceived natives as belonging to one undivided or homogenous culture cannot be substantiated with any empirical evidence. *The Limits of Orientalism* analyzes English scholars who visited India during the pre-colonial and colonial period to show that travelers did understand the difference between Hindus and Muslims, as the latter were considered as foreigners like the Europeans, both belonging to an alien culture as far as Indians were concerned. At the same time, the book shows that later scholars realized the importance of Hindu culture and respected the vitality of Hindu civilization.

It is true that some scholars considered Indians to be "barbaric" and "uncivilized," but this does not mean that all English writers ac-