CrossMark

commonality of pocket maps and the people who purchased them. Another poet influenced by surveys is Jonson, but to a very different end. His poetry is often read as supporting the Crown, but in truth Jonson believed that persons were part of the commonwealth and that citizens had the personal responsibility for the common good. Jonson's urban vision reflects a London teaming with immigrants, moving on their own through London and creating it as they go. They are not bound to a royal city, but a city negotiated by a broken compass (Jonson's motto) that creates a city rather than measuring it. This can easily be compared to Davenant, the clearest example of the alignment of poetry and mapmaking. Davenant (as laureate) considered both poetry and cartography numerical, and he used his poetry "to dismantle commonwealth topographies and replace them with a universal map of corporate identity grounded in the mystical body of the king" (153). Milton, on the other hand, creates a "spatial liberty" that fosters freedom and movement that encourage the reader to develop his or her own intelligence.

In addition to the poets who structure the book, Lecky includes a great deal of information about the various mapmakers who essentially contextualized English space. Her argument is very convincing and interesting all the way through. As one might well imagine, the book is filled with information about the various artisans, but Lecky is an excellent writer and she makes her intricate subject clear to all. It's well worth reading.

Michael Denbo, *Bronx Community College, CUNY*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2020.402

Solitude and Speechlessness: Renaissance Writing and Reading in Isolation.
Andrew Mattison.
Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019. viii + 260 pp. $75.

Andrew Mattison's wide-ranging book combines analysis of how reading and writing are represented in early modern literary texts with analysis of the actual social practices of reading and writing in early modern England as they conditioned and shaped literary history. Among the strongest of his claims is that, in its solitude, literary production could unmoor writers from their time and place and orient them toward unimaginable future readers. He argues that an awareness by early modern writers themselves of the possible misfit between their work and their contemporary readers opened the door to a form of ambition that went beyond mere acceptance by their contemporaries. This line of argument amounts to an implicit argument against New Historicism's concern to collapse literary ambition into courtly ambition, and it leads Mattison to a reappraisal of George Puttenham, whom New Historicists treated as the canonical early modern theorist of the coincidence of poetic and courtly ambition. More generally, Mattison

https://doi.org/10.1017/rqx.2020.403 Published online by Cambridge University Press

develops an approach to early modern literary texts that highlights how they can float free of their historical context to become meaningful in unexpected new contexts. His final chapter, for example, includes a sympathetic reading of Hugo von Hofmannsthal's radically decontextualized appropriation of Bacon in his 1902 prose work, *Ein Brief.*

This approach would seem to place Mattison squarely in the methodological camp of presentism, but he also offers historicized interpretations of how reading and writing (and solitude) are represented inside early modern literary texts. The first chapter focuses on the sonnets produced within the Sidney-Pembroke circle and tracks the tension between denying poetic ambition in favor of claiming the genuineness of love and emotion and aiming for literary recognition, including in a scarcely imaginable future. In considering the discourse of the Sidney circle, Mattison argues that Fulke Greville comes very close to articulating a specifically literary kind of ambition, writing that "in his arguments against excessive concern with place and praise and in his insistence on the irreplaceability of natural talent, he makes a surprisingly good case for separating literary from social ambition" (35).

In subsequent chapters Mattison extends the argument (with important variations) to an impressively wide range of writers including Spenser, Herbert Cowley, Marvell, Traherne, Donne, Jonson, Philips, Tourneur, Chapman, Middleton, and Bacon. In a discussion of Amelia Lanyer, Mattison writes that her "decision to print her poems is not the culmination of her social ambitions, but the mark of their failure and subsequent redirection toward a broader but less immediately gratifying ambition" (39). Of interest here is the implied claim that female poets can also (and, in fact, may be more likely to) move in the direction of asserting a literary ambition that is not reducible to social or courtly ambition.

Some of the texts Mattison discusses are very well known while others are notably obscure. Indeed, obscurantism itself becomes a theme for Mattison as he addresses the willful difficulty of Donne and others, which he treats as a sign of ambivalence about being read by current and future readers at all. Interestingly, even as he advances this argument Mattison also registers an internal objection to it, writing that "there is a problem here regarding intention: reading for a poet's intent to be unreadable can lead us into an interpretive Charybdis from which no meaning can escape" (99). Provocative as his claims are, it is worth asking whether Mattison sometimes overestimates the ability of early modern writers to conceive of and to assert artistic ambitions that seek to transcend whatever forms of recognition and reward might be available in their own historical worlds. After all, theirs was a world without what Pierre Bourdieu calls a "restricted" cultural economy for serious art. It may be that such a restricted cultural economy is a necessary precondition for the wish for artistic recognition as opposed to mere popularity in the here and now. Moreover, Mattison's method is not always successful in generating new and engaging interpretations of the most well-known poems he discusses. Nevertheless, Mattison's approach is impressive as it is applied to the broad sweep of early modern writers and the unexpected paths of literary history.

https://doi.org/10.1017/rqx.2020.403 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Mattison's own readers will be fascinated by the scope of his knowledge and the suggestiveness of his conceptual apparatus.

Daniel Juan Gil, *Texas Christian University*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2020.403

Robert Burton's Rhetoric: An Anatomy of Early Modern Knowledge. Susan Wells. RSA Series in Transdisciplinary Rhetoric. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2019. xii + 212 pp. $84.95.

Susan Wells's book is as much a rhetorical study of Burton as a study of Robert Burton's rhetoric. In fact, rhetoric is only one among several subjects that Burton pursued in the course of his capacious studies and, as Wells herself notes, it was hardly the most important. Accordingly, only one chapter in *Robert Burton's Rhetoric* directly considers what Burton read and knew about rhetoric as a discipline, and that chapter appears as part of a sequence of chapters that examine Burton's learning in medicine, as well as his interests in classical and contemporary languages. For Wells, these subjects collectively reveal Burton as a deeply exploratory thinker, one who preferred individual cases over general precepts and who recognized the importance of provisional judgments in the face of necessarily partial information. They also are made to illustrate a certain porousness in the very conditions that made their collective study possible. As Wells maintains, Burton's learning environment was far more permeable and made for far greater exchanges of knowledges and practices than the "fully differentiated disciplines" (123) that make up present-day universities. This is questionable, of course, but the point emphasizes the underlying concerns that give rise to Wells's study of Burton in the first place—namely, the problem of making knowledge credible across a broad range of diverse, and at times disputed, intellectual activities.

To that purpose, *Robert Burton's Rhetoric* assesses *The Anatomy of Melancholy* for what it offers to contemporary studies in rhetoric and transdisciplinary scholarship. The answer, it turns out, is plenty. Wells regards Burton not only as a writer, but also as a broker of knowledge practices. In his lifelong accumulation of learning and his notoriously irregular organization, he composed a text that mediated not only multiple disciplines but also competing methods in the production of knowledge. Wells also regards Burton as a painstaking reader, all the more so when his habits of reading are rendered more visible to contemporary audiences. (As she notes, her study has its origins at least partly in her rediscovery of *The Anatomy of Melancholy* in the hefty Clarendon edition, a striking contrast to the comparatively simplistic Everyman's edition she had read through years before.) Once viewed responsibly, Burton's techniques of drawing from hundreds of sources, and of testing competing claims against one another, may well offer significant rejoinder to the principles of empirical observation and experiment

https://doi.org/10.1017/rqx.2020.403 Published online by Cambridge University Press