one that lies outside the remit of this study. Nevertheless, Coffey's meticulously researched and audaciously argued book should at the very least compel us to re-examine the tumult of the 1640s and to think again about the complexity of ecclesiastical polity. Those who continue to urge a portrait of the period as the seedbed of secular liberty will, like his contemporaries, find Goodwin a formidable obstacle and paradox.

D. F. McKenzie and Maureen Bell, eds. *A Chronology and Calendar of Documents Related to the London Book Trade 1641-1700*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005. Vol. 1. 1641-1670. xviii + 643 pp. $160.00. Vol. 2. 1671-1685. 458 pp. $187.00. Vol. 3. 1686-1700. 468 pp. $187.00. Review by RANDY ROBERTSON, SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY.

The *Chronology and Calendar* is a staggering achievement. Some years ago, D. F. McKenzie began to collect references to the book trade that he discovered in the *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic* (*CSPD*), the *Journals* of the House of Commons and the House of Lords, and the *Court Books* of the Stationers' Company during the span 1641-1700. As Maureen Bell notes in her brief introduction, McKenzie had relied on the indexes of many of these official documents; as Bell observes, however, the indexes are far from exhaustive, so she undertook the daunting task of combing through the entirety of the *CSPD*, the House *Journals*, the Stationers' Company's *Court Books*, and the Historical Manuscript Commission *Reports* for the years covered in the *Chronology*. She provides generous excerpts and paraphrases of the relevant entries, along with full citations and a superb index. The result is a magnificent reference set that should change the field of seventeenth-century book history.

The Bell-McKenzie volumes afford an unparalleled view into the relationship between the government and the Stationers' Company, the guild that held a virtual monopoly on British publishing from its incorporation in 1557 to the lapse of the Printing Act in 1695. The *Chronology* sheds light on complex and sometimes murky topics, such as the mechanics of early modern censorship, the ways in which the Stationers enforced their intellectual property regime, and the habits and predilections of early modern readers. The citation of works that do not appear in the sources calendared but are nevertheless relevant to book historians is one of the work's many nice touches.

The *Chronology* offers, as well, clearer portraits of the "players" in the early modern book trade: authors who published their works anonymously frequently come out of hiding in the official records, as do printers and publishers who published the works *sine nomine*. For example, we learn from parliamentary examinations that while Queen Henrietta Maria was the nominal author of *The Queen's Maiesties gracious answer to the Lord Digbies letter, and the Parliaments censure to the 18. Rebels* (1642), John Bond was likely the real author, a fact not recorded in either the Wing Catalogue or the English Short Title Catalogue (*Chronology*, I, 39, 42). Such examples could be multiplied.

One drawback to such a colossal work as the *Chronology* is that readers might mistake it for a comprehensive treatment of censorship 1641-1700. Bell is careful to note that the State Papers contain much that is not calendared in the *CSPD*, but there are other official sources not encompassed in the *Chronology* that detail instances of censorship: the *Thurloe State Papers*, the *Clarendon State Papers*, and archival records of the Stationers' Company aside from the *Court Books*, just to name a few.

Perhaps the most significant flaw of the *Chronology*, however, is its medium. Given the scope of their project, McKenzie and Bell cannot have caught every reference to the book trade in the *CSPD*, the House *Journals*, etc. Indeed, in my own research on seventeenth-century censorship and copyright I have come across several dozen references to the book trade in the documents they consulted that did not find their way into the *Chronology*, and although the books have been extremely well edited, I noted a handful of errors in the text as it stands. Yet owing to the cost of printing and publishing university press books, mistakes and omissions cannot easily be corrected; new editions would be prohibitively expensive, and supplements would prove ungainly, as the entries would no longer be in strict chronological order.

Internet publishing would offer an obvious solution to these problems if the cachet of publishing with an academic press were no obstacle. Bibliographers in particular need to move beyond the idea that publication in book form is *de rigueur*. Indeed, the terminally incomplete nature of most bibliographical reference works suggests that hypertext is the appropriate medium for them. Such works need to be revised, corrected, and supplemented continually, and they are, in the upshot, a collaborative endeavor. Undoubtedly, seventeenth-century newsletters that report on books seized by government searchers or other book trade matters await discovery in the Bodleian,

the Huntington, the Folger, and elsewhere. In a hypertext publication, such records can be added without ado. (Full disclosure: I am currently nearing completion of an "Index" of works censored 1641-1700 that will be published online.)

Equally important, hypertext publication can have a democratic dimension. It doesn't always these days: Early English Books Online (EEBO), Eighteenth Century Online (ECCO), and other online subscription services are astronomically expensive and have created a class system within academia. But the British Library has made the English Short Title Catalogue (ESTC) publicly accessible (estc.bl.uk/), and British History Online has made a trove of primary and secondary documents available gratis (www.britishhistory.ac.uk/). Indeed, ESTC is rendering the Wing volumes and even the Wing CD-Rom obsolete, for, as we have noted, with an online publication new entries can be added, and a revised "edition" produced, with just a few keystrokes. And the more widely available a resource is, the more readily it can be corrected.

Nonetheless, Bell deserves the gratitude of all book historians and scholars of the early modern period. The three-volume set that she has brought to fruition is a marvelous resource, and, despite the high cost of the collection, no library that is serious about the study of book history can afford to be without it.

Conal Condren. *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England: The Presupposition of Oaths and Offices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. x + 399 pp. $95.00. Review by PETER JOSEPHSON, SAINT ANSELM COLLEGE.

If Conal Condren's claim in *Argument and Authority in Early Modern England* is right, then almost everything political theorists think they know about early modern England is wrong. "[W]e might dispense with the organising notion of early modern political theory" (10), he writes, either because the early modern framework is misleading or because politics and theory were not really what was at stake in those contentious times. "[O]ffice is what matters," and any evaluation of political thought should properly be subordinated to the central idea of office (7, 197, 343). (Condren thus rejects Aristotle's claim, that politics is the authoritative good and that offices are subordinate to