subjects of chapters four and five, create important changes for these agents that Smith thoroughly explores. First, there was no longer a centralized court and thus a disbursement of agents and Royalists supporters occurred, thereby making their job more difficult. Beyond this, with Charles II becoming the new figurehead of the Royalist cause, the factionalism continued as individuals competed for his favor. The next few chapters deal with the royalists responses to Cromwell and the Commonwealth and the various plots to return the monarchy to power—often through the proposed execution of Cromwell. The book ends with the Restoration and the attempt by the Royalist agents to be awarded for their continued and dangerous service. Here, O’Neill became a groom within Charles II’s bedchamber.

Smith has produced a work that provides important insight into the Royalist cause during the British Civil Wars, especially how the factions/rivalries within the court hindered the cause and how the agents, because of this factionalism, relied upon patrons to protect their position. Because of this, there was not a unified Royalist cause; rather, various groups saw individual opportunities within supporting the King. The work is solid and straightforward and works to expand our understanding of the other side of the British Civil Wars.


Most of this book was first published in the 1990s as articles and/or as a book, in Italian. The research is thus rather dated, with few references in this heavily footnoted work much less than fifteen or twenty years old. The book surely reflects the political context of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, and it was in part inspired by various “revisionist” interpretations of Communism and the Russian Revolution. But Benigno’s focus is on revolutions of the seventeenth century, and he makes a solid case for approaching them comparatively. More specifically, he examines in detail more or less contemporary revolutions of the 1640s: especially the English Civil
War, the French Fronde, and the Neapolitan Rebellion, while he also makes references to the Catalan Revolution in Barcelona.

Examination of revisionist historiography of the English Civil War, or the “English Revolution” as Benigno prefers to call it, and of the French Revolution, takes up an entire chapter, as does the consideration of the usefulness, or lack of it, of the concept of a “crisis” of the seventeenth century. Benigno suggests that there was indeed a crisis on a European scale, and that it was a crisis regarding the legitimacy of monarchical order; the question many were asking was were there alternatives, perhaps constitutional alternatives, to monarchy as it existed? But most of what Benigno discusses in these chapters reads like the kind of review of the literature that one often finds in doctoral dissertations: perhaps informative, but also quite tedious. Many of these pages have at least as much space devoted to notes as to text. The 1989 bicentennial of the French Revolution, and the publications it elicited, cast a long shadow here.

Benigno quite rightly points out that comparison of the various revolutions of the seventeenth century is not merely an exercise of interest to historians working in later centuries, but rather what was happening in England in the 1640s was of great interest, at the time, on the Continent, and what was happening on the Continent was followed with interest in England. How historians have or have not studied ways in which one revolution influenced another, even how there may have been a contagion factor, a kind of “spread of a fire or an epidemic” (128), Benigno highlights effectively.

The Fronde of 1648-52 has been interpreted variously, but some historians do indeed emphasize both foreign influence on events in France and the influence of events in France on revolutions elsewhere. There is also the matter of the relationship, if any, between the Fronde of the mid-seventeenth century and the French Revolution of the late eighteenth century. Some historians, inspired by Voltaire’s commentary on the Fronde, dismiss it as but a kind of intrigue, or series of intrigues, fostered by nobles and judges who did not even know what they wanted. Was the Fronde thus but a kind of parenthesis in what Voltaire called, admiringly, the century of Louis XIV? Benigno does a fine job of documenting these points of view, but also of showing their weaknesses.
Who the agents of revolution were is one of the questions historians ask, and perhaps never resolve to everyone’s satisfaction. On the cover of this book is a reproduction of a painting from seventeenth-century Naples showing a raucous crowd participating in executions, or lynchings as we might call them. The crowd is poorly dressed; some of the figures cheer and shout while others participate more directly in the grisly business at hand. One man, holding a severed head high on a pike, wears especially shabby and torn clothing. In this image, the people are the agents of revolution, yet some individuals may play larger roles than others.

In his chapter on Naples, Benigno stresses the centrality of one individual, Masaniello, the poor fisherman turned revolutionary leader, and yet he also emphasizes that the Neapolitan conflict of 1647-48 was one in which the people, collectively, were agents of revolution. The poor rose up against the rich, the nobility, the government, and Spanish domination. Many clergy, Benigno argues, supported Masaniello, and indeed did more than that by supplying the insurrection with a legitimizing religious language that lauded a divinely-approved just war in which those who gave their lives for the cause were martyrs. Thus when Masaniello himself was killed he was seen as “a Christ who was offered in sacrifice for his people, the lamb of God who knew he would be sacrificed…and who—obviously—will rise again” (307).

With the important exception of his analysis of Masaniello, Benigno in fact gives very little attention to religion in this book. This lacuna seems most problematic regarding England in the 1640s. How is one to understand the conflicts involved without attention to Puritan critiques of the Church of England? If the mid-century saw a temporary victory for Puritans, in the 1680s Catholics enjoyed a brief respite under James II (reign 1685-88). His defeat and replacement by Protestant monarchs is usually referred to as the Glorious Revolution, but it barely gets a mention in this book on seventeenth-century revolutions. This silence on the part of Benigno seems quite odd. And in the case of the Fronde in France, some historians place considerable importance on the Parisian parish clergy and on Jean-François Paul de Gondi, coadjutor to the archbishop of Paris. Here, too, this study could profit from more on religion and revolution.
This book is not as reader-friendly as it could be. There is no index, and no bibliography. With the exception of the cover image, no images whatsoever are included, though surely imagery must have played a major role in everything at issue in this book. At one point, images on coins in Naples are given brief attention, but discussed only briefly, and without any illustrations added to help the reader. Yet the book’s title is suggestive of seeing: does a mirror have any function but a visual one?

Despite its limitations, this book has much to offer historians of early modern Europe, especially those interested in comparing contemporary events in several countries.


Early in *Thomas Traherne and the Felicities of the Mind*, James J. Balakier observes that Traherne’s storied “Felicity” has not been the subject of a book-length study, a startling fact to consider given the centrality of the concept to Traherne’s work and thought. Balakier’s book provides a long overdue treatment of the recurrence of Felicity across the Traherne canon, with readings of *Centuries of Meditations*, the Dobell and Burney poems, *Christian Ethicks*, *Commentaries of Heaven*, and the four unpublished treatises in the rediscovered Lambeth manuscript. Balakier locates Traherne’s understanding of Felicity in the axes of the seventeenth-century sciences, with a particular emphasis on Bacon and Hobbes. “[A]t a time when philosophy, religion, and science were intertwined,” claims Balakier, “Traherne’s true importance lies in his endeavors to frame a modern science of cognition that complements and extends Hobbesian materialism” (28). Traherne’s aversion to Hobbes’s secular materialism has long been noted, but Balakier adds to the narrative by suggesting their common reliance on “thought experiments” as a means of developing a science of cognition. As Balakier explains, while the empirical bent of Traherne’s methods (particularly in the *Centuries* and the Dobell poems) owes chiefly to