interaction of creature and Creator (with the accompanying assumptions about the value of ceremony and sacraments) which separated a true Calvinist from one who questioned the distinctive doctrines and focus of Calvinism. This attention to getting the theological issues right is commendable and refreshing in a field where convenient labels are still used to paper-over the genuine diversity of the era. Peter White's caveat that a simple dichotomy between Calvinism and Arminianism should not be allowed to oversimplify the range of theological opinions in this era should always be heeded (8), but Towers is not guilty of such an oversimplification.

On the basic question of the effectiveness of censorship prior to 1640, Towers' study is considerably more nuanced than previous considerations of the topic, and it is a good model of valid historical argument. Tyacke's narrative is powerfully supported here, but the usefulness of Towers' book extends beyond its address of a specific debate in the field. Throughout, it contains useful summaries of the issues actually dividing the Church of England at the time. It also provides a narrative in its own right of the course of censorship in the period, which can profitably inform both literary and historical studies pertaining to religious literature, censorship, the Civil War, and the history of the Church of England. Finally, it has much to say about the actual influence of Laud and his policies, the significance of religion and ideas in historical causation, and the mechanisms by which effective censorship may occur.


How can a good Christian also be a good soldier? This dilemma of conscience was already ages old in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when Christians opposed each other in bloody warfare.
Protestants fought Catholics in the Thirty Years War (1618-1648) on the European continent, and Protestants fought Protestants in England’s Civil Wars (1642-1648). Faced by the terrible conditions of the military camp and the battlefield, it is reasonable that soldiers on either side of a conflict might question any cause that led them to kill the enemy in the name of God, whose directive not to kill was familiar to them all. Religious questions and political issues were nearly indistinguishable during the wars between the Royalists of Charles I and the Parliamentarians throughout the 1640s. Supporters on each side published floods of religious justifications in the form of treatises, essays, and pamphlets to explain how a good soldier was, indeed, doing God’s work, but only if he recognized and fought for the correct side.

In *The Christian Soldier*, Robert Thomas Fallon has assembled several tracts from the English Civil Wars in which scripture provided justification for fighting other Christians and for killing in warfare. Fallon also has provided a clear commentary to illuminate the circumstances surrounding the publication of each treatise. Taken from the microfilmed Thomason Tracts, a collection of 23,000 seventeenth-century publications in the British Library, London, several of these tracts appear in facsimile or transcript in the book, and a chapter entitled “Other Tracts” addresses additional ones. Fallon focuses upon *The Souldiers Pocket Bible* (1643), *The Christian Soldier’s Penny Bible* (1693), Parliamentarian and Royalist versions of *The Souldiers Catechisme* (1645), and *The Christian Souldier, or Preparation for Battaile* (1642) as indicators of the intense and unyielding religious fervor of the time.

*The Souldiers Pocket Bible*, published anonymously in 1643, leaned heavily upon Old Testament verses from the Geneva edition of the Bible to sustain Parliament’s soldiers through qualms of religious conscience. Selected passages appear under a series of sub-headings such as “A Souldier must love his enemies, as they are his enemies, and hate them as they are gods enemies,” (11) an argument which justifies the annihilation of God’s enemies but not the soldier’s own. Further on, apparently in light of several
Royalist victories that year, the *Pocket Bible* reminds its readers that God sometimes allows the enemy to annihilate the godly, especially when the latter have demonstrated too little faith or too much sin. Nor should the good soldier despair when the battle is going against his side, since God has been known to send help “in the very nick of time” (16). The *Pocket Bible* was successful enough in its purpose that it was reprinted during the reign of William and Mary and again during the American Civil War, the Spanish-American War and World Wars I and II. It has continued to appear in reprint editions, even as recently as 1995.

*The Christian Soldier's Penny Bible* was a revision of the *Pocket Bible* published in 1693 when the common soldier needed justification for fighting on the king's side rather than against him, as had been the case in the Civil Wars. At the time, William III was king, and his combined Anglo-Dutch forces had suffered serious defeats by the French at Steinkirk in 1692 and at Landen in 1693. As a reflection of its time, the verses included in the *Penny Bible* were taken from the King James edition of the Bible, instead of the Geneva edition favored earlier in the century by the Roundheads. This concise work calls God “a Man of War” and directs its reader to endure hardship “to please him who hath chosen thee to be a Soldier” (27-28).

Of particular interest is *The Souldiers Catechisme* (1645). Published by the Reverend Robert Ram in eight editions in less than two years, the original Parliamentarian's version was parodied by the Royalist clergyman, Thomas Swadlin of Oxford. Fallon has included both versions on facing pages for comparison. The *Catechisme* appears as a series of questions with the correct answers below them. One important question was whether a subject was ever justified in fighting against his king. The correct answer, according to Ram, was that Parliament's soldiers were not fighting against their king but were endeavoring to save him from the evil influences of popery and the bad advisors who surrounded him and led him astray. Whether a Christian should ever fight against another Christian from his own country was another question.
Ram's answer demonstrated that a Royalist could not be a Christian, since Royalists were God's enemies and had chosen to side with the Antichrist. Swadlin's parody of Ram's *Catechisme* ridicules the arguments favoring Parliamentary forces, which he calls "a Schismaticall Malignant Fraternity" (63). At times, Swadlin lapses into pedantic indignation at Ram's scriptural errors and fails to maintain the parody.

Fallon, Professor Emeritus at LaSalle University in Philadelphia, is a specialist on Shakespeare and on the military imagery of Milton. He is also a retired infantry officer and a graduate of West Point. His compilation of religious tracts published specifically to sustain and encourage soldiers provides an excellent collection of primary source materials for Britain in the seventeenth century. In addition, his clear and well-informed commentary, including pithy synopses of the century's political events, makes *The Christian Soldier* an excellent work for university libraries.


The core thesis of April Lee Hatfield's *Atlantic Virginia* is deceptively simple: that the New World English colonies, far from being isolated settlements, were in fact extensively interactive with each other, with their homeland, and even with other nationalities. There is more to this claim than meets the eye on first encounter, and therein lies the thoughtful contribution of this new study of the pathways of transatlantic, inter-colonial and international exchange in trade, people, information, and cultural practices, especially in early Virginia.

The influential context of Spanish-American models emerges as arguably the most important element in Hatfield's book. The Spanish example in the New World, Hatfield indicates, set