the ways in which information and knowledge were constituted and communicated in her culture” (151-52). Her thoughts on Behn are characteristic of the interesting connections she establishes between diagrams and literature throughout the book: as she argues in conclusion, “reflections of the ‘brainwork’ fostered by non-narrative and diagrammatic images contribute to the distinctiveness we enjoy in the work of each of these writers” (152). Acheson’s exciting book offers similarly distinct readings of these writers and the complex visual culture in which they participated.


Christina Lee, in her introduction to the volume, claims: “toward the end of the sixteenth century, any literate European with a curious mind would have been aware of … the geographical and cultural differences among the territories in the subcontinent, the Southeastern islands, and East Asia” (3). It is this claim—of the irreducible transnational interests, from trade to art to intellectual history—of Early Modern Europe that the volume sets out to validate.

Section 1, “Imagining the Far East from Europe,” has essays focused on cartography and literature, domains in which the imaginary geography of China and the Far East was constructed. Ricardo Padrón, in his essay, examines Spanish maps from the sixteenth century. Proceeding from the assumption that it was “possible for mapmakers to slice up the world differently, according to the interests of the kings they served” (21), Padrón shows how “east of…” and “west of…” were descriptors that centered Europe. Further, the mapmakers constructed a marvellous or fantastic geography of the world, potentially full of surprising wealth for Europeans. Padrón also shows how the continent of America had to be brought into the cartographer’s fold as a part of the “West.”

Christina Lee’s essay deals with Luis Barahona de Soto’s long poem “The Tears of Angelica” (1586). Lee notes how the poem represents Asia as a conglomerate of kingdoms, with China as its commercial-cultural
center and its civilizing force. But for Lee, what is interesting about Barahona’s poem is that, in it, China comes to symbolize “a wealthier and more exotic version of a Western European power” (62).

Section 2, “Discovering the Far East,” opens with Liam Brockey’s essay on the Iberian origins of Sinology. Using Spanish and Portuguese travel documents from the sixteenth century, Brockey notes three stages in the rise of Sinology. In the first (1520–1570), there was a considerable interest in the location and extent of the Ming Empire. In the second (1570s–1620s), there was greater enthusiasm in discovering the nature of Chinese civilization, notably its political, economic and philosophical aspects. In the third (1620–40s), Iberian scholars studied indigenous writing, hoping to unravel any moral lessons China might hold for Europe.

Nicholas Koss’s essay tracks the Chinese writings of Matteo Ricci (The Christian Expedition to the Chinese undertaken by the Society of Jesus, 1615), as they appeared in English adaptations by Samuel Purchas in the latter’s Hakluyts Posthumous (1625). Through a close reading of Purchas’s editorial methods and comments, Koss reveals England’s fascination with, and fear of, China as a great civilization and power. Purchas also took care, notes Koss, to soften Riccio’s arguments that Chinese religions were compatible with Christianity and even goes on to “censure the Jesuits in China for being more tolerant of non-Christian Chinese than of Lutherans and Calvinists” (97).

Diego de Pantoja’s early seventeenth-century writings are the subject of Robert Ellis’s essay. Pantoja’s own cultural framework, argues Ellis, was a hybrid of European and Asian elements and, therefore, his views on China are “a mediation between two imagined essences of cultural selfhood” (106). This means there is no straightforward negative commentary on China, which is not also tempered with a positive view, especially regarding Chinese scholarship and arts. Like Ricci, Pantoja seeks to prove that Chinese religion is compatible with Christianity, notes Ellis, and is therefore “one of the more radical exponents of accommodation” (114).

Haruko Ward’s essay concerns Pedro Morejón’s writings on Japanese martyrs of the Christian age (1550–1650). Ward argues that Morejón, who worked as a confessor to the Japanese nuns (called “bikuni”), situates the Japanese Christian martyrs in the same tradi-
tion as the European martyrs of the early church. By representing the tortured bodies of women martyrs—which he frequently described as “weak”—as analogous to the tortured body of Christ, Morejón treated them as “the Incarnate Divine Person.” Like Ellis’s, Ward’s essay demonstrates the accommodative tendencies toward Eastern religions among the Europeans.

Section 3 is geographically centered toward Japanese and “Chinos”—a category that included people from Southeast Asia and Philippines as well as China—who travelled to Europe. Juan Gil traces the Asian migrants to Spain, back to the 1520s, some of them being brought as slaves by Spanish officials returning home from Manila. Labelled “Indios” by the Europeans, Gil argues that the “Chinos” acted as a close-knit community when brought to Europe.

Extending Gil’s concerns is Tatiana Seijas’s essay on Asian men in the law courts of the Council for the Indies. Siejas notes how all the Asians refused to call themselves “Chinos,” preferring to be called “Indios.” This nomenclature, she notes, was significant because the latter indicated a free subject of the Spanish Empire, and “Chinos” signified slaves, indentured labourers and servants.

Marco Musillo’s study of the Japanese Tenshō embassy to Rome (1585) argues that the Japanese, once they arrived in Italian civic spaces, had their identity re-evaluated, as foreign guests and nobility. As exotic elements, they were slowly incorporated into the theatre of public power. For Musillo, this incorporation into the civic space was a process the Japanese themselves actively participated in.

Mayu Fujikawa’s studies Pope Paul’s interactions with a Japanese delegation, led by Rokuemon Hasekura of the early seventeenth century, as represented in a fresco on the Sala Regia Hall of Palazzo del Quirinale, a papal residence in Rome. The entire attempt, Fujikawa notes, was to present the international fame and relevance of the Pope. As she puts it, the “purpose was not to depict recognizable Japanese individuals, but rather to commemorate the grandeur of the papal ceremony, in which the foreign guests were participants” (197).

Lee’s volume fits in with the larger shift in readings of the Renaissance and Early Modern Europe seen in collections like J. G. Singh’s *A Companion to the Global Renaissance: English Literature and Culture in the Era of Expansion* (2009), Houston (ed) *New Worlds Reflected:*
Travel and Utopia in the Early Modern Period (2010) or Johanyak and Lim’s The English Renaissance, Orientalism, and the Idea of Asia (2010) that attempt to demonstrate how Early Modern Europe was irreducibly transnational, whether in the form of its consumption of products, such as tea and china, or in the exchange of ideas. The essays in Lee’s collection focus mainly on Spanish and Portuguese texts and thereby expand our knowledge of the Early Modern’s encounters with the racial-cultural Other, in this case the Far East. Essays like Koss’s in the volume are particularly fascinating for their focus on cultural productions and their politics of editing and adaptation. As a person familiar only with English textual materials on Asia, I was much benefited through Lee’s volume, as I discovered the wealth of work on China. As a series itself, “Transculturalisms” is a major intervention in literary-cultural studies of the Early Modern period, and Lee’s is a fine contribution to the area.


In this book, Elizabeth Mazzola takes as her subject the complex attitudes regarding female literacy in the early modern period. She opens with examples of individual women and their anxieties about the condition and practice of their literacy sharing, as Mazzola explains, “doubts about their own linguistic abilities” and the reception of these by a variety of audiences. The book makes use of a rich assortment of textual sources ranging from legal texts, autobiographies, poetry, dramatic, and prose texts by both men and women. Chapter One considers the relationship between tutors and students including the ways female students could manipulate this relationship. Here, she discusses the ambiguity concerning female literacy in the period, often seen as inferior to male literacy, and the agency that may have come from this ambiguity. She writes that under the “cover of illiteracy, inferiority, or confinement to the household women might engage in politically charged activities” (43) through the invisibility afforded them by cultural attitudes towards female literacy. She also explores