purposes and of their impact upon the European intellectual and political scene.

Betty S. Travitsky. *Subordination and Authorship in Early Modern England: The Case of Elizabeth Cavendish Egerton and Her "Loose Papers."* Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 1999. xii + 290 pp. + 35 illus. $30.00. Review by LISA J. SCHNELL, UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

In 1981 Betty Travitsky edited *The Paradise of Women: Writings by Englishwomen of the Renaissance.* Though slim in size, it was huge in scope and influence: a whole generation of scholars whose work has been focused on early modern women writers can point to that anthology as their starting point. In the preface to the 1989 reprint of the book, Travitsky herself reflected on the work her compilation initiated: "For the literary scholar, the examination of previously unnoticed, and sometimes misrepresented writings by Renaissance women (often written in unconventional genres) has raised important questions about the nature of literature and the empowerment of the literary canon" (xvii). Almost 20 years later, Travitsky asks those same questions of the manuscript papers of Elizabeth Egerton.

As the title of this recent volume implies, Travitsky has produced not just an edition of Elizabeth Cavendish Egerton's "Loose Papers," but she has used the occasion of editing the papers to produce a book-length "case study": a 170-page consideration of the conditions of early modern authorship, particularly for women. The impetus for the monograph came at least in part from Travitsky's profound frustrations–which she details in full–with the gaps in the Bridgewater family library, most of which was acquired by Henry E. Huntington early in the twentieth century for what is now the Huntington Library. Her frustration is entirely understandable: some books were deemed duplicates (of books already housed at the Huntington) and sold at auction; some papers were deemed private or personal (including the manuscript

Travitsky edits as part of this volume) and remained at Mertoun, in Scotland and are available only as poor-quality facsimiles; still other documents and books have been mislaid, or miscataloged; certain documents, perhaps by Elizabeth, have been misattributed to her sister, her mother-in-law, her husband. Such problems produce gaps in the record of Elizabeth Egerton's life and literary pursuits that, though they frustrate Travitsky, become "silently instructive" (13).

For Travitsky the main piece of instruction concerns the issue of early modern subjectivity. In a sentence that articulates this argument, even while it also illustrates some of the weaknesses of her writing, Travitsky says: "Perhaps the most significant of the unexpected insights effected by the gaps and silences in the record is a negative general hypothesis concerning the writings of the countess, of other women in her family, by extension, of other conventional, i.e., law-abiding, women writers in early modern England, and (most unexpectedly to me) of subordinated men: that the subjectivity commonly attributed to these early modern women writers as well as to other subordinated early modern persons should be interrogated, that it may be highly limited, even a fiction, an ahistorical (mis-)reconstruction of early modern consciousness on the model of twentieth-century experience" (13-14). Her point, though not particularly well-executed, is well-taken, but it is hardly the first time this argument has been made. And indeed, there is not enough acknowledgement in the monograph of the extensive and sophisticated work that has been done by Arthur Marotti and others on early-modern manuscript culture.

But if the monograph reveals some critical lapses in the larger argument Travitsky is attempting to make, it is almost entirely redeemed by her fascinating account of the specific situation of Elizabeth Egerton's subordinated subjectivity. Elizabeth Cavendish Egerton, the daughter of William Cavendish and Elizabeth Basset Howard, grew up in one of the wealthiest families in pre-Civil War England. Travitsky is particularly interested in the influence exerted by her father, who seems to have encouraged in all five of his surviving children (5 others died in infancy) a taste

for extravagant country living and a courtly (as opposed to a pious) sort of literary sensibility. One suspects that Travitsky would like to do more with the effect produced on Elizabeth Egerton by her stepmother, Margaret Lucas Cavendish, whom her father married shortly after the death of Elizabeth's mother in 1643. Travitsky spends a lot of time discussing the literary notoriety of Margaret Cavendish but the discussion amounts, in the end, to little other than thin speculation about the relationship between Cavendish and her stepdaughter. Indeed, by 1643, at the age of 17, Elizabeth was already married and would appear to have been fully subsumed by yet another prominent aristocratic family. Elizabeth's husband was John Egerton, probably best known as the youngest brother in the first performance–before the Egerton family–of Milton's *Comus*. The Egerton family surely numbers among the most literarily sophisticated aristocratic families of the seventeenth century, but the family is also a splendid example of an aristocratic family in crisis.

Travitsky's thick description of the household over which Elizabeth and her husband presided is aimed mainly at understanding the kind of patriarchal "interference" that can be seen in some of the extant Egerton manuscripts, in particular one by Elizabeth–" Divine Meditations upon every particular Chapter in the Bible"–that is heavily edited in her husband's hand (curiously, it is not this manuscript that Travitsky reproduces in the edition, but instead one for which no real evidence of editing exists). And though one suspects that Travitsky's own ambitions reside primarily with her argument concerning literary subordination, both the monograph and the edition of the illuminating, and occasionally deeply moving, "Loose Papers" that follow it are perhaps most valuable for the scrupulously-researched account of a prominent–and remarkable–early modern aristocratic household. Indeed, the way in which Travitsky has opened the door to further consideration of this important material, together with the timely reminder (in an age that seems to be retreating from book culture) of the intricate and sometimes hidden economies of "papers" that so often determine what we know of a literary career, make this volume as

important a contribution to seventeenth-century studies as was *The Paradise of Women.*

Mark Charles Fissel. *English Warfare 1511-1642.* London and New York: Routledge, 2001. xviii + 382 pp. + 38 illus. $25.95 [library edition $85]. Review by IAN GENTLES, GLENDON COLLEGE, YORK UNIVERSITY, TORONTO.

Mark Fissel advances a strong and ably-supported thesis– that the English accumulated a great deal of military experience in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, that they were conversant with the new techniques and technologies of the "military revolution," that they sometimes achieved military victories against the best armies of Europe, that they were courageous, adaptable, and eclectic, but that they refused to become a military culture. He thus effectively challenges the argument of David Eltis and others that England was militarily backward and inexperienced during this period.

English Warfare is grounded in a breathtakingly impressive quantity of research. It is densely factual, and up to date with the most recent historiography in the field. Fissel writes clearly, but his prose is some times less than sure-footed, resulting in a book that takes considerable effort to read. But the effort is rewarded.

For example, Fissel highlights the relatively little-known fact that Elizabeth sent more men to the wars than her bellicose father. Her reasons were also more compelling than those of Henry VIII: the genuine defence of the realm and protestant commitment. It is surprising to learn that English involvement in the Dutch war of independence dated, not from the Earl of Leicester's expedition of 1585-6, but from 1572, when Elizabeth sent a contingent of 'voluntaries.' Within a few years these troops had won their spurs, demonstrating that they "could work in unison with allies, hold their ground, and perhaps even more importantly, maintain discipline in the crucible of battle, even against the best forces in Europe" (141).