

capability to abstract. Goodey also analyses the influence of Locke's doctrine on the eighteenth-century theories of behaviour and modern educational practices: "Locke replaces an organic, behavioural and provisional model of foolishness with one that is disembodied, intellectual, and permanent" (326).

Researchers and scholars interested in studying intelligence and lack of intelligence in periods before the twentieth century will find this book one of the most relevant works.

But as intelligence is a peculiar idea maybe many researchers will continue asking why our modern understanding of "intellectual disability," a contingent and accidental notion, crystallised around 400 years ago and what that implies for us in our current century, not only in Western but in the whole world. I am sure it will continue to be contingent and accidental but in what sense and what kind of human beings are currently classified by these notions? Is also animal's intelligence part of the scenery about the lack of intelligence we should analyse? How does Goodey's thesis about the contingent and accidental definition of disability, intelligence and lack of intelligence affect our new and future conceptions of human self-representation and animal representation? Reading this book will give you some answers but it will also increase the number of questions.

Jayne E. E. Boys. *London's News Press and the Thirty Years War*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2011. x + 338 pp. \$99.00. Review by NICOLE GREENSPAN, HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE.

With *London's News Press and the Thirty Years War*, Jayne Boys builds upon the growing interest of historians and literary scholars in international news. Through detailed examination of the periodical press between the 1620s and 1640s, and meticulous research into the areas of contemporary print, news, and political cultures, Boys seeks to demonstrate "the interplay between high domestic politics, international relations and London news publication" (2). The book is divided into three sections. The first broadly treats the development of print and news cultures in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Chapter 1 focuses on the popular interest in and market for

news, while chapter 2 expands the discussion to news networks on the continent. Chapter 3 explores the beginning of English periodical news and the creation of a syndicate of publishers to enable the production of regular news coverage. Chapter 4 tackles the commercial side of news and the role of publishers, discussing such issues as labour and apprenticeships, the size of print runs, and the costs of production. Taken together these chapters present a lively account of the development of the periodical press and offer a dynamic exploration of a vibrant news culture.

The second section, comprising chapters 5 and 6, examines the roles of editors and readers in shaping periodical news. Editorial practices such as contextualizing international news, numbering and dating weekly issues, and addressing readers were among the strategies used to attract audiences. Boys also shows how these techniques evolved over time, as readers became more familiar with the conventions of printed news and international news reporting.

The third and final section treats politics, licensing, and the press during the reigns of James I and Charles I. Boys supports recent scholarly efforts to rehabilitate James's political and foreign policies, arguing that the king "was aware of the power of words and sought to influence public opinion" (209). Though not always successful, James, with his licenser Sir Francis Cottington, tried to make sure that the news press generally supported his policies and did not print material that could challenge his goals. Charles, however, adopted a "*laissez-faire* approach to the press" (211) and did not concern himself with public opinion until it was too late. From the outset of his reign, through the ill-fated campaigns against Spain and France, the suppression of newsbooks between 1632-1638, and the outbreak of civil war in Britain, Charles "simply did not appreciate the desirability of telling his side of events, nor see the need to persuade" (268).

Boys examines news and print culture from a variety of perspectives, including those of production and distribution, the development of editorial practice, the influence of high politics, and the significance of periodicity. This multiplicity of angles highlights the rich context for the development of news culture. On the other hand, at times these discussions can seem disconnected from one another. For example, the general overview of international news networks more provides a

backdrop for the discussion of the London press rather than embeds London news networks in their international context. Much of the source material on news relating to the Thirty Years War is the English newsbooks themselves—what Boys refers to as “internal evidence” (49). International news channels and trade in news on the continent could be linked more firmly to the specific news networks in early Stuart London and printed news production on the war.

Boys has a strong command of the events of the Thirty Years War and early Stuart high politics. It should be noted that readers are expected to possess a similar degree of familiarity. People, political events, government policies, battles, and diplomatic negotiations in Britain and on the continent are regularly mentioned without identification, definition, or indication of their significance. This expectation of familiarity seems to extend to scholarship as well. References to disparate points and arguments frequently are contained, without distinction, in a single footnote, which can be confusing and sometimes misleading. Problems with clarity are evident in other ways. The prose itself often can be imprecise or unclear; such issues as the overuse of pronouns, dangling modifiers, and run-on sentences can render meaning opaque. At times the difficulty seems more conceptual. There seems to be some confusion between licensing and registering texts, for example, and in discussing revisionist and post-revisionist debates over early modern censorship the differences between these positions tends to be unclear. Perhaps this is why Boys appears to support both revisionist and post-revisionist arguments (91).

In spite of these caveats, Boys sheds considerable light on the ways in which English newsbooks borrowed, adapted, and moved away from continental (particularly Dutch) models. In addition to increasing our understanding of the development of English periodicals, the monograph also helps explain the fascination with and establishes the importance of international news in early Stuart England.