

minimizes what truly would have been a legitimately interesting study on material that is unfamiliar yet important.

Philip Major, ed. *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640-1690*. Farnham, England, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010. xvii + 215 pp. \$99.95. Review by KATHRYN VOMERO SANTOS, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

Scholars have long acknowledged that the events of the English Revolution forced many men and women into exile, but it is only in recent years that historians and literary critics have begun to devote significant attention to the effects of such displacement on the literature and culture of the second half of the seventeenth century. Philip Major has assembled an interdisciplinary collection of essays that examine the full range of these effects by presenting new approaches to the historiography of exile during and after the English Civil Wars. Published as part of Ashgate's Transculturalisms 1400-1700 series, *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath, 1640-1690* has two main goals: to contribute to the ongoing project of recuperating a history of the royalist exiles and to expand the traditionally Anglo-centric focus of existing scholarship on the Revolution to include English engagements with the continent as well as with the New World. As Lisa Jardine notes in her foreword to the collection, scholars must account for these transcultural exchanges if we are to fully understand "the intellectual and cultural history of the British Isles in the second half of the seventeenth century" (xviii).

The historiography of exile during this period has presented a number of methodological challenges, many of which are outlined by Timothy Raylor in the first essay in the collection. As Major fully acknowledges in his introduction, it is somewhat jarring to read an opening essay that seems to critique the larger project of the collection in which it appears, but it is nevertheless an important perspective that sets the tone for a volume that demonstrates a deep commitment to discussing methodology and identifying new areas of research. For Raylor, the difficulties stem first from what he calls "problems of definition" (20). The category of "exile," narrowly defined in political terms,

limits the scope to a specific group of people (the royalists) during a short period of time. Raylor advocates instead for examining “English Civil War Travelers,” which would allow scholars to take a broader view of Anglo-European interaction. Furthermore, Raylor contests the notion that England was intellectually isolated before the English Revolution and argues for an approach that recognizes continuity in English engagement with the continent. The second problem Raylor identifies is one of evidence. We should always be aware, he cautions, that the particular circumstances of exile and related movements across borders had serious effects on the completeness and quality of the records on which scholars typically rely.

Despite Raylor’s misgivings about the archival limitations in the study of exile during and after the revolutionary period, many of the collection’s contributors conducted impressive research in English, continental, and early American archives. Most notably, Marika Keblusek brings together a wide range of sources, such as letters, scrapbooks, manuscripts, acquisition records, and accounts of personal book collections in order to map out what she terms “exile book culture” in her essay on the role of printed and manuscript texts in the royalist and Anglican experience in exile during the 1650s. In her consideration of individuals who “felt forced to escape into a self-constructed universe of paper and words,” Keblusek also explores the centrality of reading and studying to the “inner exile” that many people experienced as the Church of England went underground during the Commonwealth (83).

Although all of the essays contribute to a broader understanding of the impact that exile had on the writing and reading practices of the mid-to-late seventeenth century, two pieces deal explicitly with the ways in which exile shaped the literature of the period. Christopher D’Addario, who has written at length on the topic of exile and seventeenth-century literature, demonstrates that the experience of being in exile and away from the English language deeply affected Abraham Cowley’s relationship to the poetic endeavor and forced him to embrace the polyvalence of language. Nigel Smith, on the other hand, notes that historians of literature, politics, and religion have not fully explored the ways in which the presence of English exiles on the continent also had effects on European literature. Smith deftly illumi-

nates this phenomenon by analyzing plays, poems, and other forms of writing in Italian, Dutch, German, and French that represent and engage with English politics of the period. Smith even goes so far as to suggest that the royalist exiles living in Europe “transformed their destinations, and helped start the great obsession with English culture and letters that is such a mark of eighteenth-century Europe” (106).

While the first eight essays certainly deliver on the promise to expand the typically Anglo-centric focus of revolutionary historiography, the final two essays by Philip Major and Jason Peacy broaden the geographical and temporal scope even further by examining the regicide exiles living in New England. Drawing on the limited archival resources that survive in the form of letters, journals, legal papers, and eyewitness accounts, Major and Peacy both attempt to reconstruct a sense of how regicide fugitives lived in the colonies and what kinds of relationships they maintained with their homeland. In many ways, these self-reflexive final essays reveal the fact that, as Major notes, this is a “new frontier in the study of exile born of the English Republic” (166). Indeed, both essays preview an exciting area of future research for scholars of English, American, and transatlantic cultural history.

The essays in *Literatures of Exile* are thoughtfully organized in such a way that encourages the reader to make clear links between neighboring essays and to follow various threads that run throughout the collection. Individually, the essays make substantial contributions to our understanding of the English Revolution and its complexities, but the true innovation of the collection is its sustained attention to methodology. *Literatures of Exile* does not claim to be able to fill any of the gaps it identifies comprehensively. Rather, each contributor uses new research ultimately to gesture toward more work to be done on this rich topic. As it both showcases and inspires new work, *Literatures of Exile* is a successful model for any collection of essays.