

Connolly explores “the politics of honor” in Lady Ranelagh’s correspondence. Three of these chapters adroitly demonstrate the extraordinary benefit of blending archival and theoretical methods of approach. Julie Eckerle’s contribution lays out the results of her exploration of the 150 women’s petitions in the William King archive held at Trinity College, Dublin, tracing the bold rhetorical strategies employed by a single memorable petitioner. Amanda Herbert reads the letters of Eliza Blennerhassett, demonstrating how the author “deployed her emotions” (187) to “construct a cross-channel, archipelagic identity by using seventeenth-century Ireland, as both a location and an idea, to influence her sense of self, memory, and place” (183). While Herbert engages only seven surviving letters, Naomi McAreavey distills her argument from more than three hundred extant letters of Elizabeth Butler, first Duchess of Ormonde, offering a nuanced reading that refuses to flatten the robust identities of her subject. “If the Duchess of Oromonde herself eschewed the labels of ‘Irish’ or ‘English,’ ‘Catholic’ or ‘Protestant,’” she reasons, “it remains difficult to place her within such binary categories” (164).

While individual chapters introduce largely unknown writers, the volume is intended to engage with familiar ones as well. The editors, too, draw on previous archival research and theoretical frames to craft the volume’s overarching themes. Invoking an “archipelagic” or “devolutionary” approach (2, 3), Eckerle and McAreavey are able to confront and diffuse the Anglocentrism that has obscured early modern women’s cross-channel exchanges, and to highlight the fluidity of identities constructed in these passages. Committed to recovering Ireland as both a historical site and a cultural idea, the volume asks us to consider more subtle and complex understandings of the early modern lives at the center of life writing, as they evolve from the interplays of place and memory, convention and emotion. Most resoundingly, though, this remarkable collection excitedly calls us back to the archives, where too much of women’s writing still lives. “The field is still young,” the editors conclude, “and much remains to be uncovered” (254). This rigorous, joyful collection takes a valuable first step forward.

Patricia Phillippy, *London, England*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2020.201

Premodern Ecologies in the Modern Literary Imagination. Vin Nardizzi and Tiffany Jo Werth, eds.

Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019. xvi + 340 pp. \$75.

This collection is the inaugural publication of the Oecologies research cluster, a gathering of literary scholars in the Pacific Northwest who critically return to ecology’s pre-modern predecessor, oecology, in medieval and Renaissance archives. They seek to practice what Ursula K. Heise describes in the afterword as “historical eco-

cosmopolitanism,” an elaboration of her earlier argument for planetary citizenship in *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet* (2008) but, this time, with a bent toward the past. Whereas eco-cosmopolitanism initially emphasized “a concept of place ‘as an indispensable condition for environmental ethics,’” the authors in this volume consider how the literary past provides “touchstones” for environmental engagement in the ongoing moment of climate crisis (285).

While such thinking might seem unbecomingly presentist for scholars of distant literary periods, these essays cleverly rethink history’s relationship to the present in ways that are not linear but rather scalar, composite, and fleeting. The most novel is Jeffrey J. Cohen’s theorization of “eco-temps,” a phenomenon prompted by the medieval materializations of *climat* and *sesoun* in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. For Cohen, they enact “composites of time and climate, ephemeral locales that through repetition endure to bequeath across history a multisensory archive” (29). The knotting of ecological time to geographic space is as much sensorial as it is aesthetic. In fact, the collection’s editors, Vin Nardizzi and Tiffany Jo Werth, urge their readers to recognize that “the temporal is inextricably enmeshed with the territorial” (8).

What makes these essays distinct—indeed, timely and necessary—is their deep embeddedness in the authors’ local environments. Prior to writing, the contributors were asked to address how the landscapes where they live, study, and teach influence their approaches to premodern literature. Home is the starting point for historical eco-cosmopolitanism. Take, for example, Patricia Badir’s beautifully photographed chapter on British Columbia’s Kettle Valley Railway, a defunct and dilapidated system of train stations named for Shakespeare’s best-known characters. Her own backyard magnifies the immediate and proximal stakes of an ecosystem trending toward ruin, one that seems to allegorically follow in the ruinous footsteps of Shakespeare’s fallen: Othello, Juliet, Lear. Similarly, J. Allan Mitchell spotlights a local artifact of environmental significance in Ontario’s Museum of History: an astrolabe of uncertain provenance that materializes temporal and spatial dislocation. The object, he argues, is “an ecological interface among times, places, politics” and, as such, unsettles colonial narratives of national belonging (278). Both essays make connections among “the local, the global, and what lies in between” by attending to what Heise identifies as “different scales, power structures, and cultural boundaries . . . that inflect place and planet-consciousness today” (287).

The book contains two types of essays. The first are longer meditations on “the environmental conditions and histories” of home and their impacts on premodern research and pedagogy (11). The second are shorter companion essays that respond to the central questions of the former. One of the most electric pairings is that of Sharon O’Dair and David K. Coley. O’Dair takes a hard look at the profession and reveals how the economic model of the neoliberal university is unsustainable, both professionally and environmentally. To redress our carbon debt, she urges scholars to return to a slower pace, “to a life based in sundry crafts, or methods, and the study of them, a life of a certain

asceticism” (171). Coley follows O’Dair with a harrowing vision of environmental failure: what happens when connectedness and cosmopolitanism lead to epidemiological emergency, as was historically the case with medieval plague. His essay ends with an admission of a professional sort of environmental failure: “a failure of my own will to untie my research from the comfortable moorings of history and bring it to bear on the crises of the present” (191).

Although Nardizzi and Werth coordinate the collection around couplings, the result is far less tidy. Much crosstalk occurs among the authors as the essays touch and then depart from one another, often careening in disparate yet equally fascinating directions. The editors see the book as a transit map, “a conversation from different hubs,” and an exercise in translation across geotemporal locales (10). *Premodern Ecologies* is a significant contribution to medieval and Renaissance ecocriticism but is, above all, a much-needed provocation to reimagining the ways we teach, conduct research, and inhabit our “multiculture and multispecies communities” as planetary citizens (287).

Perry Guevara, *Dominican University of California*
doi:10.1017/rqx.2020.202

Christopher Marlowe, Theatrical Commerce, and the Book Trade. Kirk Melnikoff and Roslyn L. Knutson, eds.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018. xxii + 314 pp. \$99.

This book puts some of the most recent developments in Marlowe and early modern studies into fresh dialogue, with particular emphases on repertory, book, and reception studies. The editors’ combined expertise in these areas is exceptional and seems to pick up on the insistence of looking between the print and theatrical perspectives more usually separated in scholarship that informed Kirk Melnikoff and Edward Gieskes’s earlier collection on Elizabethan authorship, *Writing Robert Greene*. Like that book, this volume demonstrates that when conceived, written, and edited with the cohesive focus and careful cross-references usually associated with a monograph, an edited collection can transform a scholarly field.

The book is full of fascinating observations: repertories that specialized in the news, Plantagenet history, and the apocalypse (Knutson, 35, 37, 39); Eoin Price’s suggestion that “more might be done to think about the possibility of lost playhouses” (47); and the startling fact that the bell rings for “more than 10 per cent of” *Massacre at Paris* (Evelyn Tribble, 66). Genevieve Love on disability and the *Faustus* texts, Paul Menzer’s cross-century and cross-continent insistence that “canonicity is not inevitable” (217), and Matthew Steggle on a Marlowe celebrated for his comedy, pastoralism, and beauty all point ways forward for future scholarship. Though Steggle rightly queries the idea of Marlowe and Day collaborating, it might be worth considering the possibility that the latter revised the former’s work (244).