

Heather Dubrow. *Deixis in the Early Modern English Lyric: Unsettling Spatial Anchors Like "Here," "This," "Come."* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015. ix + 135pp. \$67.50. Review by NICHOLAS D. NACE, HAMPDEN-SYDNEY COLLEGE.

In the late 1990s, everyone studying early modern literature was writing about space and place, or so it seemed. Paul Alpers's *What Is Pastoral?* (1997) returned us to the pleasures of the *locus amoenus*. Tom Conley's *Self-Made Map: Cartographic Writing in Early Modern France* (1996) sent us looking into the gazetteers of the *imago mundi*. Just a few years later, we had Andrew Gordon and Bernhard Klein's *Literature, Mapping, and the Politics of Space in Early Modern Britain* (2001) to describe for us the "paper landscapes" that attempt to control human perception of the *verum orbis terrarium*. And, everyone, in whatever period of study, was still reading Jürgen Habermas to understand the public's sphericity and citing Benedict Anderson to explain how public spheres roll across national boundaries. At roughly this same time, Heather Dubrow, the most expert reader of Shakespeare's narrative poems and an editor, with Richard Strier, of the landmark historicist collection *The Historical Renaissance* (1988), offered one of her more forceful exemplifications of what had started to be called the New Formalism. In an essay for a special issue of *MLQ* entitled "Reading for Form," Dubrow argued, apropos of Marvell's *Upon Appleton House*, that "Social place is established and represented through decisive spatial placement." Fifteen years later, she offers a much-needed analysis of the precise mechanisms by which "spatial placement" can be "decisive" in *Deixis in the Early Modern English Lyric: Unsettling Spatial Anchors Like "Here," "This," "Come."*

That a newly emergent focus on spatial placement would be linguistic in nature was not, by the end of the 1990s, obvious. A few years into the new millennium, the abstractions of Franco Moretti (also a contributor to *MLQ*'s "Reading for Form") seemed ready to reposition literary analysis by pushing it away from close reading—however perfunctory it had gotten in the hands of New Historicists—and toward an opposite sort of formalism. His maps hoped to take literature through digital radiography into spatially rendered morphologies of formal textual attributes. But for all Moretti's interest in zooming

out into space in order to conduct “distant readings,” maps appear to have been the least valuable of his triad in *Graphs, Maps, Trees* (2005). Despite the promise of digital humanities to give us a better purchase on form, which has only truly happened with Dan Shore’s *Cyberformalism: Histories of Linguistic Forms in the Digital Archives* (2018), the best studies of space in early modern literature during the decade after Moretti tended to approach the issue either from a cultural studies perspective, as in Julie Sanders’s *The Cultural Geography of Early Modern Drama, 1620–1650* (2011), or a performance studies perspective, as in Tim Fitzpatrick’s *Playwright, Space and Place in Early Modern Performance: Shakespeare and Company* (2011). What these studies showed was that after the revolutions of New Historicism and the occasionally concerted effort at a New Formalism, the two approaches to literature seemed unable to exist at the same time, let alone in the same study. They had become incompatible.

After patiently waiting, Dubrow has finally arrived at a moment in which her historically informed attention to precise linguistic coordinates may finally have the influence it deserves. In recent years, her prescience has finally become clear and her persistence has finally been rewarded. Now we might list studies that have given formalism the rigorous theoretical re-rationalization it has deserved. Ric Bogel’s *New Formalist Criticism: Theory and Practice* (2013) and Caroline Levine’s *Forms: Whole, Rhythm, Hierarchy, Network* (2015) are two works that have made formalism viable once again. With the new theoretical interest in “lyric” among poets, theorists, and critics (of which Dubrow is all three), the formerly glamorous study of the Renaissance lyric seems destined for a restoration.

Deixis in the Early Modern Lyric gives us a sampling of what a Neo-New Formalist approach to lyric can be. As a sample, it perhaps also shows how various it must be by buttressing an attention to form with insights from various subfields of linguistics, early modern history, art history, literary history, and lyric poetry from Thomas Wyatt to Frank Bidart—often through Jonathan Culler, whose concept of lyric apostrophe is something of a counter-song of this study. And the authors studied are often elucidated with sidelights from classical antiquity (Quintilian, of course, should factor into any history of pointing).

Dubrow offers some general and methodological observations in her “Introduction: Delimitations, Definitions, Disciplines” as well as her concluding chapter, “Here Today and Gone Tomorrow? Conclusions and Invitations,” but the nature of deixis requires that its words be studied for—and in—their peculiarity. The book’s first chapter likewise offers a prospective view of what’s to come, pointing to a variety of stimulating if unlikely contexts from which the rest of the study will draw, demonstrating how polymathic a scholar of deixis must be. Here we find, among other things, discussions of installation art by James Turrell and Scott Burton, who create a conceptual “in” and museumish “out” that troubles the “here” and “there” of inter-architectural reference. The chapter ends with a brief discussion of what unfortunately can only be called the haecceity underlying the concept of *terroir* in viticulture.

Dubrow is among our most historically informed formalists, new or old. Chapter 2, focusing on Spenser’s “Epithalamion,” makes perhaps the best case in the book for the ways that attention to deictics can help make claims for issues operating at the national and political levels. Specifically the chapter examines Spenser’s “strategic spatiality” found in words like “come” and “go,” which the linguist Chuck Fillmore has described as “deictic motion verbs,” and what might be understood as purer indexical words such as “heere,” which, like the “now” with which it is often paired, relies for all its meaning on context. Prepositions such as “here” are not just a reflection of the world’s complexity but a constituent element of it, performing the task of forging connections, not just describing them. What Spenser strategically organizes with “heere” is precisely the relationship of the locale with the moment “now,” which hints at a disunity in this poem about unity as it “gathers together the elect while Othering those excluded from the wedding” (43).

The orders of Spenser’s colonialist bridegroom to “come” “heere” “now” are followed, in chapter 3, by those that cause us to recede ever inward toward the intimate “this” that Shakespeare shows us when he turns his sonnets’ pockets inside out at their ends. Given the highly pressurized nature of the sonnets’ final couplets, which are torqued by wit that must both summarize the poem and give it a closure effect, Shakespeare often resorts to a deixis that ties things

together rather than puts them asunder. Dubrow in this way delves into deictic metatextuality. Though probably more intricately organized in a prospective line like Marvell's "Within this sober frame" at the start of *Upon Appleton House*, the nested referents organized by a "colonesque" textual "this" in Shakespeare's sonnets likewise offer the created distance of authority that reenacts problems with the promissory nature of the genre, and perhaps of form itself.

Of course, pastoral writing, as a mode, has always played with a "now" that contrasts with a bucolic "then," even when that blissful pastoral "here" is challenged by the preposition in "et in arcadia ego," which in Poussin's painting involves a verifying pointing at textual detail. Dubrow's foray into pastoral deixis takes her to Lady Mary Wroth's *Pamphilia to Amphilanthus*. Song 1, "The Spring now come at last," offers what might be a synthesis of Dubrow's previous concerns with its Edenic "then" and rusticated "heere" that contrasts with the hustle and harangue of an urban or courtly "there." Drawing on work by Paul Alpers and Don Friedman, Dubrow offers a discussion of Wroth's use of "heere" that returns to the patch of soil in the first chapter in which she draws an analogy from *terroir*. The deictics aerate the "soil that generated the poem," we find, and the looseness of the loam, we might say, is what produces different varieties of pastoral.

Because Dubrow starts the entire book with a brief discussion of Donne's "The Flea," which requires the addressee to "mark in this" in a way that increased focus cannot clarify, we are primed for a return to Donne, which we find in the discussion of "Hymn to God my God, in my Sickness" that comprises chapter 5. After all, as Dubrow says, "If deixis had not already existed, John Donne would have invented it" (94). But our own inventiveness, elucidated by Dubrow, seems no less potent than Donne's. This most virtuosic of all the book's readings also constitutes the best proof that attending to deictics can provide a view of a poem simply inaccessible by other means (which is here proven by the fact that this reading diverges from nearly every other and still makes considerable sense).

Deictics in the devotional context seem especially ripe for interpretation because they appear to involve every aspect that Dubrow argues might have been in play in "The Flea": "linguistic, cognitive, and possibly even physical events" (2). Wielding the somewhat la-

bored concept she calls “prevenient proximity,” Dubrow documents the “spatial recording or negotiating of anticipated proximity to the divine” (94), an instance in which time is rendered as space. This chapter demonstrates Dubrow’s talents for perceiving ambiguity and performing the doctrinal hairsplitting that might offer clarity, though in the case of Donne, the acrobatics displayed by the reading, while impressive, seem to constitute the point of the chapter. Ultimately, the “prevenient proximity” found in Donne’s poem proves no more profound than the prognostication commonly found on road signs that “bridge freezes before road surface.” We do use the language of space to refer to time, and sometimes, looking toward the future, we cannot tell whether the bridge will freeze at an earlier moment in time than the road freezes or in the location directly in front of where the bridge meets the road surface. Such niceties of distinction do not often matter.

The people who teach prepositions require children to memorize vast lists of these spatial and temporal deictics (“aboard, about, along, among,” etc.), presumably on the assumption that the *raison d’être* of these words can only be surmised in a Morettian aggregate. But prepositions are much more interesting for their differences, as Dubrow repeatedly demonstrates. What’s most interesting, in fact, proves to be the way that difference itself is produced by prepositions—often in a way that conjures the specter of another term or dyad to which it is opposed (structuralism’s binarisms were, not surprisingly, drawn in terms of a spatial relationship of numerator and denominator). If, for example, someone were to offer an inducement on December 31st to “come watch the Times Square ball drop on our TV,” we get the sense that the word “on” can mean multiple—and very different—things in relation to a particular object. Poets have always exploited this, as have authors of children’s books and advertising agents. But the ends to which deictics are exploited reveal some very fundamental, though ignorable, ways by which our attention is configured for complicity.

While Dubrow’s book concerns mostly spatial deixis, time tends most often to be conceptualized through a graphic analogy and by means of many of the very same deictic words (“before,” “after,” etc.). As any writer knows, there are instances when the choice between the temporal “further” and the spatial “farther” requires the help of meta-

physics. But the methodological problems of seeing reading in terms of closeness instead of time remain with this study. As Dubrow admits in her concluding chapter, “Skimming is replacing scrutinizing”—not only in digital media, but also in many kinds of programmatic reading styles that have proliferated in the wake of New Historicism, some of which actively invite us to reduce our “attentiveness to the nuances of language” (121).

But “scrutinizing” and “attentiveness,” for all the depth these investments offer, generally occur in a piecemeal manner, in spots of time, whereas “skimming” performs what is considered the more valuable temporal work of connection, of moving forward quickly enough not to sink into the depths. While Dubrow prognosticates a “New Nationalism some years down the professional pike,” one that will no doubt mark out expansive new “theres,” perhaps the best way to describe what she has done in this book is create a New Reader Response criticism. This style of criticism can chart not only the way different deictics structure time, but it can unite them in time and offer some sense of our actual, not only our ideal, experience. After all, Reuben Brower insisted on the phrase “slow reading” to refer to what everyone else called “close reading.” The difference, of course, is how we orient ourselves: we either look for something “in” a text or find something “through” a text. Dubrow not surprisingly echoes this distinction, giving us a way to bring time and space together, to read both closely and slowly.

W. B. Patterson. *Thomas Fuller: Discovering England's Religious Past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. x + 368 pp. \$94.00. Review by NATHAN J. MARTIN, CHARLESTON SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY.

In *Thomas Fuller: Discovering England's Religious Past*, W. B. Patterson has written a thoughtful, insightful, and generally interesting account of Thomas Fuller, who had a unique position in the seventeenth century to view the chaotic political changes that accompanied his age. Patterson's ability to weave this intellectual biography between a micro and macro-historical study speaks to his ability as a writer and researcher. Patterson himself is a Professor Emeritus of History at the