

scholars to look more closely at the “first refuge.” The book’s end apparatus includes a Consolidated Bibliography and an index, which, unfortunately, does not include entries for authors of secondary works. Overall this is a much-needed volume in a field attracting new critical attention and should be of use to historians and scholars working in other fields such as literature and art.

John S. Pendergast. *Religion, Allegory, and Literacy in Early Modern England, 1560-1640*. Aldershot:: Ashgate Publishing, 2006. 187 pp. + 6 figs. \$89.95. Review by DAN BREEN, ITHACA COLLEGE

Among the cultural transformations effected by the Reformation, scholars of late medieval and early modern religion, history, and literature have long recognized that the ways in which Protestant ideologies changed Western understandings of textuality must be counted among the most significant. In particular the subject of literacy has attracted a great deal of attention. As the reading and interpretation of Judeo-Christian scripture came to be central to Protestant versions of soteriology, a new emphasis on basic literacy skills and on individualized engagement with scriptural texts emerged. Recently, scholars such as James Simpson have returned to this topic in order to challenge the intellectually democratizing narrative of Reformation-era literacy articulated most famously by Elizabeth Eisenstein in *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change* (1979). In *Religion, Allegory, and Literacy in Early Modern England*, John S. Pendergast joins this discussion by beginning with a simple yet crucial question: how can we define literacy in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? Drawing upon the work of E. D. Hirsch and Lawrence Levine (as well as of Walter Ong), Pendergast suggests that literacy must be understood in two different but related ways. Certainly, the term designates the ability to recognize printed characters as units of language, but literacy also describes a much broader cultural function. For Pendergast, literacy is also an institution through which a culture transmits and preserves its own hermeneutic standards. In becoming literate, then, early modern readers learned not only how to read but what to read, and how to interpret what they read. Using

this observation as a point of departure, the book proceeds through an expansive account of early modern reading practices in order to advance two major claims: first, that the process of learning to read entailed important assumptions about how to interpret texts; and second, that this pedagogical connection developed from a fundamental concern among English and Continental Protestants to regulate (or, to use Pendergast's term, "normalize") scriptural exegesis. As such, Pendergast seeks to reconsider one quite tenacious element of our understanding of Reformation-era confessionalization—namely, that Catholics and Protestants nurtured absolutely oppositional approaches to textual interpretation and dissemination—and to suggest instead that Catholic and Protestant attempts to stabilize scriptural reading shared some remarkable similarities.

The book is divided into two parts. In chapters one through five, Pendergast advances his chief claims and traces the development of different philosophical and pedagogical models of reading in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. This is done against the background of an examination of Augustine's understanding of Biblical allegory as both a hermeneutic and a polemical tool. In Augustine's controversies with the Manichees, allegory serves to locate spiritual meaning in texts that, read literally, seem hopelessly opaque. As a consequence, allegory also helps to separate different categories of interpretation and, by extension, of interpreter. Those able to read allegorically will arrive at a philosophically and theologically orthodox position; those who cannot or do not mark themselves as heterodox. Although Protestant readers and theologians attempted to discredit allegory as a disingenuous device through which the Catholic Church exercised an uncompromising hermeneutic dominance over the canon, it is also the case that Protestant pedagogy retained that principle of sorting good from bad readings. Following Henry VIII's break from Rome, and particularly under the Elizabethan settlement, the effort to normalize scriptural interpretation acquired a political as well as a spiritual importance, as "English citizen" and "Church of England congregant" became increasingly synonymous terms. During the second half of the sixteenth century, the Church and the Crown addressed the problem of religious education through a series of strategies that reflect the range of forms of literacy in early modern

England. While theological treatises and new vernacular translations of the Bible made the case for Protestant hermeneutics to an educated elite, Protestant pedagogy also targeted illiterate and semiliterate adults as well as children. Because of the importance of textual familiarity with the Bible to emerging understandings of salvation, believers who were unable to read often learned the moral lessons of the Bible in redacted form. Pendergast is particularly helpful here as a guide through these various redactions, as well as other reference tools such as Biblical commentaries and concordances designed to teach Biblical essentials according to stable interpretive standards.

This desire to maintain stability in the practices of scriptural interpretation is a key conceptual continuity that links early modern Protestants and Catholics. However, Pendergast also identifies more literal continuities that are worthy of further attention. For example, in his chapter on primers Pendergast shows that Latin maintained a crucially high profile in English Protestant education and theology. By the late sixteenth century, knowledge of Latin had taken on another fairly surprising pedagogical role, that of a complement to the vernacular as a linguistic source of nationalistic pride. In accounts of Lily's Latin grammar as well as other pedagogical texts, Pendergast demonstrates that authors of educational treatises sought to locate the Crown at the center of humanistic learning and so to carve out a place for Latin in emerging notions of English national identity.

In the second section of the book, Pendergast reads texts written by more traditionally "literary" figures in order to investigate the ways in which literature explored, defined, and contested post-Reformation approaches to textual interpretation. John Donne in his sermons offers a version of exegesis that, in Pendergast's view, acknowledges the importance of the literal sense of scripture while at the same time calling attention to the rhetorical capacities of scriptural language. Drawing on his poetic understanding of metaphor, Donne employs strategies of interpretation that attempt to clarify obscure scriptural passages by relating such passages metaphorically to others in which the meaning is more plain. Here, metaphor and typology—both predominantly "figurative" approaches to reading—are thus used to emphasize the significance of reading for the literal sense. Following a chapter on Spenser, Pendergast returns to his observations on the

cultural role of Classical learning in a discussion of Shakespeare's *Love's Labor's Lost* and *Two Gentlemen of Verona*. On the stage, the relationship between Latin and English that pedagogues understood to be complementary can seem less obviously so. Shakespeare's characters in these plays enact a class conflict which also can be oriented around pedagogical poles. Here, Classical learning contains within it the impulse to fix linguistic use and meaning, while the vernacular is used as a tool of social and cultural destabilization, and as a medium in which vernacular models of learning can be used to satirize—and, fascinatingly, to reform—humanist pedagogy.

A good deal of Pendergast's work on the close relationship between grammar and interpretation in Reformation debates about Biblical hermeneutics covers familiar ground, though it is still useful as a survey. Indeed, the book's one conspicuous flaw is that it does not engage as fully as it perhaps should with other current work on the subject. Recent research by the historians Andrew Pettegree and Ian Green, and by the literary critics Jennifer Summit and James Simpson, would have complemented Pendergast's discussion very helpfully, yet their names do not appear on Pendergast's slightly thin and slightly dated secondary bibliography. Especially surprising is the absence of Brian Cummings' *Literary Culture of the Reformation* (2002), with which Pendergast's work might engage in fascinating critical dialogue. However, the book presents a persuasive reassertion of the claim that Protestant theologians, pedagogues, and secular authorities, like their Catholic counterparts, did seek to stabilize scriptural interpretation, albeit within an emerging cultural framework that identified literacy as a valuable spiritual and patriotic skill. In addition, Pendergast locates these debates over literacy and interpretation within broader literary and intellectual contexts very effectively. Special mention should be made of his excellent chapter on Pierre Du Moulin's Eucharistic treatise in which Pendergast shows that, contrary to the conventional understanding of Protestant liturgy as grounded fully in a literal interpretation of scripture, Du Moulin critiques the Catholic understanding of the Eucharist by arguing that it is not sufficiently symbolic. Catholics, in other words, read "This is my body" far too literally—for Du Moulin and for other Protestant theologians, the communion ceremony held significance because the interaction of congregation

and clergy stood as a figure of the union of the congregation and clergy with Christ. This riveting analysis underscores one of the book's most significant contributions to current discussions on the nature of confessionalization. Here and elsewhere, Pendergast complicates still-dominant notions of confessional difference by illustrating key moments at which Protestants and Catholics each borrowed from the other's interpretive strategies, and even worked from very similar assumptions about the need for hermeneutic stability.

Thomas Betteridge, ed. *Borders and Travellers in Early Modern Europe*. Aldershot:: Ashgate, 2007. vi + 196 pp. \$99.95. Review by LINDA McJANNET, BENTLEY UNIVERSITY.

As described by editor Thomas Betteridge, *Borders and Travellers in Early Modern Europe* provides "a trans-European interdisciplinary interrogation of borders and travel in early modern Europe" (12). Of the eleven essays in the collection (nine chapters, plus an introduction and an afterword), eight are written by literary scholars, two by historians, and one by an anthropologist. Several of the literary essays consider genres such as broadsides, traveler's accounts, and the records of institutions such as Bridewell, and the majority address cultural, political, and social implications of their texts. While some of the essays trace their themes to the end of the seventeenth century, most focus upon the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Ideally, an anthology brings individually strong essays together that create a whole greater than the sum of the parts. Betteridge's collection is more successful in meeting the first of these criteria than the second.

Betteridge's Introduction focuses on the figure of the cannibal in Montaigne's "Of Cannibals" and More's *Utopia*. He concludes that these "sophisticated humanist texts" are haunted by the "essential sameness" of the European travelers/colonists and the indigenous peoples, whereas postmodern recuperations of the cannibal are part of the "naïve celebration of non-Western societies as non-antagonistic and free from the evils of modernity" (11). The essays that follow, however, are concerned with nuanced modes of othering and with literal and geographical borders, not the abstract distinction between