

I all the World, and Heaven, for ought I know,  
 My self, yea and my GOD to Babel owe!  
 Or if that seem too deep: I plainly see,  
 I owe it Worlds of Sweet Varietie. (3.443.127-30)

Such optimism and positivity have been traditional emphases in Traherne studies; however, there is much here that will facilitate a more complete analysis of Traherne, such as his discussions of “Abuse,” “Adulterie,” “Bastard,” “Atheist,” “Avarice,” and “Antichrist.”

Ross’s project as a whole is an exciting prospect for Traherne scholars, but the publication of the *Commentaries* alone is a monumental achievement and one that will be of tremendous significance. Arguably, that so much of his work has been inaccessible is a major reason for the relative neglect of Traherne as a seventeenth-century writer and thinker. Certainly, his work aesthetically is uneven—sometimes even bad—but here in the *Commentaries*, as in Traherne’s corpus as a whole, there are moments of insightful philosophy, sophisticated theology, and spectacular beauty. Now, we are all finally getting a complete access to that corpus, and for that Jan Ross and Boydell & Brewer deserve our appreciation.

Christopher D’Addario. *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. viii + 199 pp. \$85.00.  
 Review by THOMAS P. ANDERSON, MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY.

In *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature*, Christopher D’Addario encourages readers to reconsider how “the ruptures of exile” (3) after the regicide and Restoration affected literary production and reception in London. Specifically, he examines how exiled writers refashioned their literary identities after the collapse of the licensing act and the burgeoning of the London print market from which they were putatively excluded. Focusing on early colonial exiles Anne Bradstreet and Nathaniel Ward, continental exile John Hobbes, and interior exiles John Milton and John Dryden, D’Addario meticulously reconstructs the lived experience of their geographical and psychological displacement as they anxiously tried to maintain a literary voice within a London print market increasingly catering to

the “wide-ranging sympathies of a growing London readership” (13). D’Addario’s fresh account of the effect of exile on literary production is both historically trenchant and literarily nuanced. The study revises previous assumptions about literary exile during the last half of the seventeenth century by arguing that these writers consciously addressed a broader, more ideologically varied audience than their homogeneous community of fellow exiles.

In D’Addario’s account, these exiles consciously wrote “with an understanding of the diverse and geographically of ideologically distant print market into which their text would be disseminated” (12). D’Addario adapts Edward Said’s post-colonial concept of exile to assert that the nostalgic turn to the past that characterizes so much of exilic writing was a response to the memory of their lost world, but importantly, it also served a “polemical or public purpose” (11) to reconfigure the exile as central to their homeland’s current condition—“the saving remnant of an English nation hopelessly led astray” (11). As a result, their works simultaneously insisted on their remoteness as exilic texts and on their authority as representations of authentic Englishness. D’Addario’s study contributes most significantly to current scholarship on seventeenth-century English literature with its focus on the influence of exilic writing in the developing public sphere back home in London.

The first chapter on Bradstreet and Ward is noteworthy as an example of how the study of transatlantic texts continues to ask scholars of early modern English literature to reconsider those critical assumptions that tend to limit their scope only to British texts. D’Addario argues that as colonial exiles in the 1640s, both Ward and Bradstreet wrote during a “fruitful time for transatlantic production and consumption of books” (25), insisting that it is impossible to overstate the “connectedness” (27) of colonial readers and writers to the London print market. Ward’s *The Simple Cobler of Agganam* (1647) and Bradstreet’s collection of poems, *The Tenth Muse Lately* (1650) share what D’Addario describes as a “bewitching blend” (31) of material connectedness to London and a comprehension of their “new environment and political autonomy” (31) in colonial America. D’Addario carefully explores the debate over the extent to which the early American settlers felt the trauma of dislocation from their

homeland. He concludes that the nostalgia evident in these colonial texts reflects the authors' attempts to authorize their literary voices in the past ideals of an "idyllic, lost golden age" (42) that embodies the "genealogy of ideal Englishness" (42). For D'Addario, this rhetorical position aligns these writers with Marian exiles such as John Foxe or John Bale, who rewrote church history in order to "resituate their marginal community as *the English way*" (34).

D'Addario's account of John Hobbes's exile is equally as engaging. Using Hobbes's own description of his writing as "double edge[d]" (57) as a metaphor for the ambivalent affect inherent in exilic writing, D'Addario traces the complete dislocation of royalist material, religious, and social structures that before the regicide had given order to their lives, and he highlights the "extremely polemical and volatile" (58) London print market that usurped meaning and intention from Hobbes's work, "leaving it vulnerable to, and perhaps encouraging, antagonistic, inquisitive or subversive readings" (58). Dislocated from the royalist community that might provide context for his political theories, Hobbes's work was left open to interpretations not having to do with exile, defeat, or political defiance. D'Addario argues that the defining characteristic of Hobbes's *Leviathan* (1650) is its insistence that political authority is exercised through semantic control. The chapter emphasizes the exile's anxiety about publishing from the margins of the English print market and being removed from the proliferation of reading practices that generate unintended meanings and consequences. According to D'Addario, Hobbes maintains, indeed actively constructs, his reactionary philosophy from, and because of, an exile that produced the desire for a "community of readers who all maintained the same interpretive practices [that] went hand-in-hand with the construction of a well-ordered political state" (86).

The centerpiece of D'Addario's impressive study is its chapter on John Milton as an interior exile in London during the Restoration. D'Addario points out in the book's introduction that the term "interior exile" is contested and fraught with ideological implications. In his justification for using the term in his portrayals of Milton and Dryden, the author recognizes the risk of invoking the term to describe poets whose exile might well be described as "voluntary and rather comfortable" (18), turning the historically specific description of a traumatic

condition in response to real power into a romanticized, metaphoric posture of the alienated intellectual. D'Addario's study of Milton escapes this particularly pointed criticism through its meticulous account of his complete and immediate loss of the world that he had known, and more importantly for Milton's literary aspirations, "a distancing from the accepted modes of discourse" (20) as he tried to find his way into the London print market after the Restoration.

The effects of Milton's interior exile produced the desire to "resituate himself within the print world of London while attempting to comprehend the defeat of the revolutionary cause and his sequestration" (88). D'Addario looks at *Paradise Lost* (1667) and *The Readie and Easie Way* (1660) as responses to exile that counteract the "specific exigencies of political and religious displacement and his marginalization as a writer through the formulation of new modes of speaking as well as transformations of old" (88). Far from a retreat from the public sphere caused by the republican defeat, the shattering loss reinvigorated Milton's critical eye, inspiring him to transform from a proponent of reasoned political discourse into a poet of jeremiad. For D'Addario, *The Readie and Easie Way* nostalgically and idiosyncratically represents reasoned rhetoric, "while the text exhorts and cajoles a wayward nation" (101). *Paradise Lost*, however, articulates a more complex relationship with Milton's interior exile.

D'Addario focuses on the "linguistic obtuseness" of Milton's epic and concludes that these moments of opacity—poetics of negation and option as well as complex syntactical and etymological structures—"impress upon the reader that the English language is under constant strain" (123). Like Hobbes's concern about the instability of language, Milton's worry over semantic uncertainty, according to the author, should be understood in relation to his experience as an interior exile. Milton, however, negotiated his way beyond this anxiety and produced in his epic a "new relationship with its wide and diverse readership" (123). Having lost his authoritative position after the Restoration as political and social critic, Milton reestablishes this authority with his epic's representation of Adam and Eve's exile from Eden and the "shifting and fallen semantics" (123) that accompany it. In D'Addario's argument, *Paradise Lost* is a sustained, fictive world characterized by self-conscious "aporia" (121). The "fissures and

inconsistencies” (116) in the poem hint “toward epic sublimity and comprehensiveness” (116) that try to counteract the conditional yet indelible loss of exile.

The final chapter on Dryden is the book’s least persuasive account of the influence of internal exile on the late seventeenth-century political and literary critic. D’Addario admits that readers might “balk” (21) at the inclusion of Dryden in a study of English writers in exile, and at times his attempts to justify this inclusion based on Dryden’s self-perception as marginalized and subject to ridicule and derision appear stretched—perhaps a too-generous reading of the term “exile” in contrast to its more powerful applications to Hobbes, Milton, Bradstreet and Ward. This criticism, however, is not to say that D’Addario’s study of Dryden is not rich in historical and cultural context. The chapter examines the role that translations of classic authors such as Virgil played in refining what many in England thought was the new barbaric English language. These translations embodied a renewed nationalism, and for Dryden, his translation of Virgil’s epic, especially the *Dedication* (1697), underscores the realization that a translation entails the loss of the purity and intent of the original. Yet as Virgil’s English translator, Dryden acquires the authority, along with a public forum, to restore the classic poet’s original intent and to refashion himself as the ultimate arbiter of meaning.

D’Addario’s study of literary exile—both interior and external—thoughtfully addresses the way that the traumatic loss associated with geographical and psychological displacement generated inventive and at times powerfully antagonistic literary voices in seventeenth-century British literature. *Exile and Journey in Seventeenth-Century Literature* demonstrates that exile often intensified the voices of political and social resistance and that these exilic voices were often reactionary in their nostalgic reconstructions of an ideal English homeland that had lost its way after the regicide and Restoration. In addition to highlighting this nationalistic impulse, D’Addario’s study convincingly reveals how these exiled writers still actively participated in, indeed even helped shape, a London print market and its increasingly heterogeneous readership from afar.