

in favor of the reductive rhetoric of Satan is redeemed through that fall, when she transforms “guilt” into an “interior space of understanding and will” (211).

Cotterill concludes with an “Epilogue” that argues that, for Jonathan Swift and the eighteenth century, digression becomes unavailable as a generative rhetorical strategy, becoming instead, in works like *A Tale of a Tub*, a figure of madness, “the modern voice of permanent dislocation and dis-possession” (304). While one might cavil that Cotterill’s depiction of eighteenth-century attitudes towards digression is a little overstated (the feminized figure of the obsessively digressive Tristram Shandy surely bear a close resemblance to her own authors), her overall conclusion is well-conceived and convincing.

*Digressive Voices in Early Modern English Literature* is an accomplished study and a most entertaining read. Cotterill’s identification of digression in these diverse texts as a coherent rhetorical strategy operating at both the conscious and unconscious levels is enormously useful and suggestive. Her discussions of these texts are most worthwhile and explore aspects of works like *Upon Appleton House* from a perspective that is refreshingly new. It is a work that will, it is hoped, encourage and engender future studies seeking to similarly refocus our understanding of seventeenth-century writing.

Elizabeth Sauer. *Paper-Contestations’ and Textual Communities in England, 1640-1675*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005. vii + 199 pp. \$50.00.  
Review by JAMEELA LARES, THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI.

In this rewarding study, Elizabeth Sauer proposes that the mid-seventeenth century theatrical mode migrated into print, especially with the closing of the theaters in 1642, and that it generated divergent and conflicting “textual communities,” i.e., networks of writers and readers informed by a sense of audience and performance, even to the point that readers were addressed or constructed as de facto jurors. Sauer particularly focuses on trials and spectacles of punishment, which were the primary social dramas of seventeenth-century England, and for which she considers a wide variety of texts, including trial accounts, religious tracts, female-authored defenses, petitions,

newsbooks, closet dramas, political treatises and dialogues, printed speeches, and documented speech acts.

Given that this study grew out of the 1997 Folger Library Institute conference “Habits of Reading in Early Modern England,” directed by Stephen N. Zwicker, it comes as no surprise that *Paper-Contestations* is deeply historicized. Sauer identifies her methodology as “post-revisionist,” that is, allied neither with the Marxist-oriented school of Christopher Hill, which argues for distinct divisions in Stuart England, nor with such “revisionists” as John Morrill, Kevin Sharpe, Conrad Russell, and Anthony Fletcher, who insist on political continuities, but rather with such “post-revisionists” as David Norbrook, Peter Lake, and David Zaret who “resist the notion of a historical continuum” (4). Sauer’s choice of methodology is a happy one, permitting her to find alternate means of accounting for well-known phenomena.

*Paper-Contestations* proceeds chronologically from 1637-1662, the period between two decrees against treasonable and seditious publication, with an epilogue concerning the Restoration stage. Sauer’s first chapter considers published attacks in the early 1640s against monopolies on such items as salt, vinegar, pots, starch, soap, cloth, tobacco, and even playing cards. These commercial agreements diverted trade and commerce into the hands of a few, denying a livelihood to the many. Not only did publications attack monopolies, but they staged in print the trials of convicted monopolists, validating verdicts and warning others to avoid their fate. While Sauer is not the first to consider monopolies, she particularly stresses how they were attacked not merely in economic terms but also as an issue of justice and equality under the law. She also demonstrates the extent to which anti-monopolist sentiments imbue Milton’s *Areopagitica*, which rejects a ban on honest labor in the field of truth and argues instead that “Truth and understanding are not such wares as to be monopoliz’d and traded . . . like our broad cloth, and our wooll packs” (31, citing Yale Prose 2.535-36).

Chapter 2 examines how the trials of the Earl of Strafford and Archbishop William Laud were staged in various pro-Parliament texts and pamphlets, and also how this trial literature indicates a heightened awareness of the extrajudicial role performed by the reading public to whom in effect the members of the court were also pleading their case. Sauer demonstrates how the commonplace that an execution is a stage play, including the inter-

changeability of the terms *stage* and *scaffold*, meant that many of the texts played out the execution as a tragedy with cathartic effect for the nation.

This language of tragedy would later be used to describe Charles's execution as well, as Sauer demonstrates in chapter 3, which situates the execution of Charles I in relation to "a transmigrated theatre culture and emergent print culture" (58). Though Parliament had closed the theatres, the Rump staged Charles's trial before a live audience at Westminster Hall, opening the great gate to whomever wished to come. The text of the trial itself was published in full, including the king's words, which were then rehearsed and re-rehearsed with added commentary by various factions. The king himself, of course, refused to follow Parliament's script but staged an effective counter-performance of silence, as if Christ before Pilate.

But not all enemies were publicly tried. Chapter 4 investigates how the realignment of the dramatic and tragic modes along with politically prompted acts of reading could arraign other enemies by means of the closet-drama, or play as book, readily dispersed to wide audiences and encoded for recognition by their various audiences, such as the depiction of haunted perpetrators popularized in anti-Straffordian and anti-Laudian pamphlets. Paradoxically, Charles I's tragedy set the stage for Restoration tragicomedy, since only divine intervention could restore the king to his throne, as Dryden suggests in his *Essay of Dramatick Poesie*.

Chapter 5 extends the dramatic arraignment of political opponents by considering how religious dissenters entered the dramatic world of print, trying their enemies and being tried. Sauer examines several trial accounts of mid-century radicals John Lilburne, Anna Trapnel, James Nayler, Margaret Fell, and George Fox, all of which indicate renegotiated power relations as the radicals claimed their rights under the nation's laws and dramatically and effectively arraigned their accusers.

The epilogue nods to Dryden's conception of the tragicomedy as a reborn and superior dramatic genre, but gives center stage to Milton's stubbornly non-visual *Samson Agonistes*, which challenged "a nation thrown into confusion and mesmerized by spectacles that bolstered royalist power" (134). The last pages thus supply a fitting conclusion to Sauer's study of how various factions used the stage to advance their own political agendas.

In the main, *Paper-Contestations*' is a careful and convincing argument about the construction of authorship and readership in the messy mid-century. Sauer evidences a wide sampling of primary texts, makes careful and nuanced reference to secondary scholarship, and carefully and patiently builds her case with example after example. She also identifies several issues needing further study, such as how the rise of "extrajudicial popular writings" corresponded with Parliament's rise to power and its control of the press's output (15-16). Even her chapter titles argue wittily that mid-century texts were theatrical performances. For instance, rather than an Introduction, Sauer supplies a Prologue—as if to a play—with the further title, "Press Acts."

A few drawbacks to this study might be noted, one being that Sauer's study argues for a causality that it can hardly prove, i.e., that the closing of theaters led to the generation of textual communities. Nevertheless, the evidence she marshals certainly makes the causal link sound likely. Sauer also aligns herself with the current—and puzzling—critical orthodoxy that declares the rarefied stage to be the primary discursive organ of the age rather than the ubiquitous pulpit. Sauer's fine argument, however, is strong enough to succeed in either case, and well worth reading.

Jonathan P. A. Sell. *Rhetoric and Wonder in English Travel Writing, 1560-1613*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006. ii + 215 pp. + 1 illus. \$94.95. Review by M. G. AUNE, CALIFORNIA UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Jonathan P. A. Sell, lecturer at the University of Alcalá, Spain, who has published on Shakespeare, Chaucer and modern British literature, has revised his doctoral dissertation into a book that seeks to contribute to the rapidly growing scholarship on early modern travel writing. Taking up Stephen Greenblatt and Mary Campbell's (among others) work on wonder as a travel writing trope, Sell focuses on the other rhetorical devices used by travel writers (and neglected by modern scholars) to broaden our understanding of the production and reception of such texts. In the introductory chapter, Sell argues that early modern travel writers deployed a variety of rhetorical strategies intended to evoke wonder and that their readers recognized these strategies and responded in predictable ways. Modern readers, on the other hand, find the strategies unfamiliar, not recognizing their function or importance.