

stresses a number of important themes: the international context of events in Britain; the necessity of comparing and contrasting Protestant and Catholic experiences in the period – often a tale of meaningful mirroring and reciprocity; and the lasting legacy of persecution in forging British Catholic identity. There are also musings on a host of additional topics—including the role of Catholic exiles, interconfessional relations, and contemporary discussions about supernaturalism and divine intervention—and a first rate historiographical analysis that covers an impressive amount of ground and points towards future avenues of enquiry.

Chloë Houston. *The Renaissance Utopia: Dialogue, Travel and the Ideal Society*. Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2014. vii + 190 pp. \$109.95. Review by JOSEPH M. MCCARTHY, SUFFOLK UNIVERSITY.

This contribution to our understanding of utopian literature focuses on the changing form of the English utopia from Thomas More to the middle of the seventeenth century. Houston calls attention to the simultaneous preoccupation of utopian writings with their own literary form and with the imagined social forms of the societies they portray, charting their development from dialogue/travel narrative to their employment of multiple forms, an evolving “discourse of human perfectibility” aimed at perfecting the forms of society. The time period under consideration saw the transformation of the Utopia from an exercise in deploying dialogue as a means of philosophical interrogation into a narrative-based conceptualization of pragmatic reform.

The *terminus a quo* of Houston’s investigation is the publication of More’s *Utopia* in 1516, a time of widespread concern throughout Europe for reform that would not only address religious, political and social abuses and deformities but also provide opportunity for the spiritual renewal of individuals. More’s contribution to the discussion appropriated the best forms of ancient utopian writing and mediated them into the Renaissance in a production both at once powerful, exciting and puzzling, one that could be described in relatively current terms as self-referential, ironic, subversive and post-modern. *Utopia* is clear about the need for reform, ambivalent about the means of

achieving it, and pessimistic about the possibility of success. More's sophisticated construction of a dialogue of multiple voices draws upon his legal training and experience to furnish insight by exploring a variety of positions dialectically while withholding authorial endorsement. The adroit opposition of viewpoints, the commingling of truth with obvious fiction, particularly in the travel narrative, the difficulties and contradictions evident in the portrayal of the ideal society, all combine to prevent the reader from taking *Utopia* as prescriptive. The form fosters skepticism about the practical possibility of reform, a skepticism that Houston follows Richard Marius and G.R. Elton in ascribing to More's deep religious belief in original sin, a burden barring humankind from perfectibility.

Published in Latin on the eve of the Reformation, *Utopia* did not appear in English until 1551. Responding to the change in attitudes toward social and religious reform, Ralph Robynson produced a version that was less a translation than a transformation, one in which More's emphasis on the philosophical concerns of a European audience was replaced by commentary on English problems for a mixed audience. It thus became more of a piece with the proliferating dialogues of the later sixteenth century, which compared contemporary society with an ideal model and were didactic in encouraging social change rooted in individual change. Analysis of two of these, *A pleasant Dialogue between a Lady called Listra, and a Pilgrim, Concerning the gouvernement and common weale of the great prouince of Crangalori* (1579) by Thomas Nicholls and *Sivquila, Too Good to be True* (1580) by Thomas Lupton, indicates that their dialogic form is less nuanced than More's work, having only two voices, both of them in agreement with the authors' positions and with irony sadly absent. The dialogue has become what Virginia Cox called "elaborate monologue."

While Houston's primary concern is the evolution of the English utopia, she devotes a chapter to two continental utopias, *Christianopolis* (1619) by Johann Valentin Andreae and *La Città del Sole* (1623) by Tommaso Campanella, both of whom believe that ideal societies can exist, that humanity can improve itself. Such dialogue as exists in these works is conversational more than dialectic, presenting and describing the attainable ideal society and serving as an educational and improving experience for the narrator. Clearly, the changing

form of the dialogue and its turn in the direction of conversation and instruction was a European phenomenon in utopian literature, not simply an English one.

Conversation assumes an even greater role in the creation and transmission of knowledge in *New Atlantis* (1627) by Francis Bacon, an unfinished work published a year after his death together with his *Sylva Sylvarum: Or a Naturall Historie*. In Salomon's House on the island of Bensalem, which is often read as the first blueprint for a research university, the role of conversation in scientific discovery and the way in which flawed conversation may inhibit the refining and sharing of knowledge and undermine the publicizing of Bensalem means that conversation must be carefully organized and controlled, an important concept in the institutionalization of the production of knowledge with obvious consequences for the role of dialogue in utopian works. In Bacon's hands, dialogue means monologue.

He did not intend to discuss the nature of the ideal society but to set out the requisites for proper pursuit of natural philosophy. At this point, the travel narrative has replaced the dialogue as the dominant form of utopian discourse.

The influence of Bacon and of European utopian writing combined with the political/religious events of the 1640s in Britain and the growth of millenarianism led to a heightened interest in the ideal state expressed in a changed utopian discourse. One strand of this discourse was more imaginative, utopian narrative fiction leading the direction of the utopian novels of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The other strand emerged in the correspondence of the circle surrounding the polymath Samuel Hartlib, which rejected dialogue and travel narrative in favor of an extended conversation focusing on the achievement of a truly ideal society as soon as possible. The utopian moment was shortlived, fading as the Commonwealth disappeared.

Contemporary discourse is a slippery beast even though we are thoroughly steeped in its context. To chart the transit of utopian literature in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as Chloë Houston does and demonstrate the transformation of dialogue from dialectic promoting divergence to apparent dialogue or conversation that is in reality a monologue aimed at pragmatic convergence is no mean feat. To describe at the same time the persistence and usefulness of the travel narrative in utopian writings does much to advance the enterprise of

conceptualizing and clarifying the nature of the discourse of social reform in early modern Europe. Her treatment of utopian discourse in Renaissance England benefits from consideration of authors whose inclusion borders on the counterintuitive. Scholars of the period will find it perceptive and insightful; those concerned with utopian discourse in a later period will find it a sound and helpful starting point.

Mykhailo Hrushevsky. *History of Ukraine-Rus'. Vol. 10: The Cossack Age, 1657-1659*. Edmonton and Toronto: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 2014. c + 327pp. + 3 maps. Review by CAROL B. STEVENS, COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

Another volume of Mykhailo Hrushevsky's magisterial *History of Ukraine-Rus'* has become available in English translation, thanks to the efforts of the Peter Jacyk Centre for Ukrainian Historical Research at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies. It will take its place alongside earlier English-language translations of the *History*. Currently, volume one is in print, while volumes 2–5 are projected; this sequence, volumes 1–5, covers the time period through the fifteenth century. The translation of volume ten represents something a bit different—the completion of a four-volume subseries (#7–10) within the *History*; these volumes deal with the early modern history of Ukrainian Cossacks from the fifteenth century through to 1659 and the ratification of the Treaty of Hadiach. Mykhailo Hrushevsky was at work on this, the tenth volume of his history of Ukraine-Rus', when he died in 1934. When he died, only the first part of a longer intended volume was substantially complete. The original edition of the present translation was further edited and corrected by Kateryna Hrushevaska after her father's death. She succeeded in seeing it through to publication in 1936, which was, as Serhii Plokyh has said elsewhere, “nothing short of a miracle” in a Stalinist Soviet Union so hostile to Hrushevsky's historical approach. Its publication narrowly preceded Kateryna's arrest in 1938.

The central historical figure of volume ten is Hetman Ivan Vyhovsky, whose portrait appears on the dust jacket. Vyhovsky succeeded Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky who, as leader of the Cossacks, had